THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In an article in the January number of *The Congregational Quarterly*, entitled 'Scripture and Theology,' Dr. C. J. Cadoux discusses the theological view of Scripture, as distinguished from the historical view. There are many people, he says, who accept the results of criticism without realizing the immense change they imply not in Christian morals or devotion but in Christian theology. We have long got used to learning that a book or passage may not have been composed by the author to whom it is ascribed, that some of the events the Bible narrates never occurred, that the speeches it reports were not all actually spoken, that the interpretations it gives are not all accurate, and that the moral sentiments it approves are not all commendable.

But, says Dr. Cadoux, many who accept all that fail to realize that the critical victory meant a tacit recognition of the ultimate authority of that group of subjective powers conferred on man by God, by virtue of which he is enabled to distinguish not only the probable from the improbable but also the noble and the Godlike from the ignoble and the sinful. Varied as these powers may be and differently developed as they are in different individuals, they have some things in common.

First, they are subjective, in the sense of being inward. Secondly, they insist on having the last word, and are usually allowed as a matter of course to have it, and, thirdly, they are all alike forms of the love of truth, and it is therefore legitimate to speak of them collectively as 'the Inner Light.' This was the foundation on which the critic's work rested, and this has been discerned by comparatively few. The epistemology which it presupposed has not been studied. Hence the need of a *theological* interpretation of the Bible, as distinct from a purely historical one, and a doctrine that will save us from reactionism.

By all means let us examine the Scriptures theologically; but we shall never reach satisfying results as long as, while admitting the historical and literary findings of the critics, we deny or do not recognize the sovereignty of that Inner Light which alone warrants their findings and our acceptance of them, when it claims to utter a decisive word in relation to moral or religious truth.

This becomes clearer when we observe that modern expositors, who all take it for granted that distinctions have to be drawn between some parts of Scripture and others in respect of inspiration, religious value, etc., shun like the plague all serious discussion of our means of drawing these distinctions at the right places. They speak of the Bible as 'the standard or rule of Christian faith' without discerning that a document which has to have distinctions drawn between one part of it and another, cannot itself be the ultimate standard. *Ultimacy* must belong to that authority which has to draw the distinctions in it, in this case the God-given power of conscience and intelligence which we have already allowed to guide us in the literary and historical questions.

While Jesus is the centre and crown of Scripture, and we have to read and interpret it in the light of His gospel, we cannot find in Him an immediate solution of every Biblical problem that challenges us. For He Himself is given to us through history, and His story, while unique as the Word of God, is seen by us to be so only by the same means as that by which God's Word is seen elsewhere—namely, by the Inner Witness of God's Spirit. This witness compels us to draw distinctions between some parts of the New Testament and others—indeed, between some parts of the Gospels and others. And it is the final authority.

An example of what he means Dr. Cadoux finds in Barth's utterance that 'the Bible . . . is the Canon because it has imposed itself as such upon the Church, and invariably does so.' This statement Dr. Cadoux characterizes as 'not only inadequate but inaccurate and even absurd.' A 'Canon' of Scripture is nothing without its limits; and it took the Church three hundred years to settle the limits of the New Testament, while those

of the Old Testament have not been settled even yet.

'What sense is there then in saying that the Canon *invariably* imposes itself? That God is objective and sovereign, no liberal has ever denied, nor have I ever heard of one who wanted to "take Him captive and bind Him to the service of our own desires." But, in any case, to suppose that we can guard against that mistake, and get God on His own terms and not on man's, simply by taking over a traditional group of books, calling them "the Canon of Holy Scripture," acclaiming their contents (in distinction from other literature) as "Revelation," and demanding "faith" in them as a Christian obligation, is, I submit, an extremely superficial judgment.'

Dr. CADOUX refers to the well-known story of Bunyan first being comforted by Ecclus 2^{10}, then being 'daunted' because it was not in the recognized Canon, and finally, like a sensible man, resting in it as a Word of God. And his comment on this is, 'What ground is there for positing a Revelation in any writing other than the fact that we find inspiration in it?'

Dr. CADOUX pleads that we should face the real ground on which our faith rests and come to terms with the claim of the subjective to take some part in the settlement of the content of Christian belief. People hanker after the purely objective. 'Would that they could realize that, just as the recognition of the important part played by eyesight in visual experience does not subvert belief in an objective material world, and just as the recognition of the importance of our auditory powers does not imply a denial of the objectivity of speech and music, so to affirm the ultimacy of the Inner Light, on which the claims of liberal theology rest, does not make us the creators of our own God or the inventors of His Word. Then would they be able to clarify many of their puzzling inconsistencies. But so long as they remain unable or unwilling to realize it, the "veil remaineth unlifted."'

'This book is built on the premise that mankind stands to-day at one of the fateful moments of history and that the time for decision is now. The future depends on how that decision is made. The Authors believe that the answer to the World's predicament, and the solution for its antagonisms, are to be found in the Christian religion.'

These words are quoted from the publishers' wrapper of a recent book—*The Christian Answer*[1]—by a group of well-known American teachers, that has appeared in a British edition. As the Editor, Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, explains in the Introduction, it is the outcome of a preparation that began more than ten years ago, when some twenty-five men and women—most of them teachers of religion—came together in common concern for a right interpretation of the Christian faith for our day.

The names of the contributors are a guarantee of the significance of the book: Dr. Paul J. TILLICH of Union Theological Seminary, New York ('The World Situation'); Dr. Theodore M. GREENE of Princeton University ('Christianity and its Secular Alternatives'); Dr. George F. THOMAS of Princeton University ('Central Christian Affirmations'); Dr. Edwin E. AUBREY of Crozer Theological Seminary ('Christianity and Society'); and Dr. John KNOX of Union Theological Seminary, New York ('Christianity and the Christian').

Dr. TILLICH is of opinion that the present world situation is the outcome—directly in the West and indirectly elsewhere—of the rise, the triumph and the crisis of 'bourgeois society.' The rise was the period of bourgeois revolutions within a disintegrating feudal society. The triumph was the period of victorious bourgeoisie, in which a world mechanism of production and exchange was created. The crisis is the present struggle of civilization to regain control over the forces loosed by regnant industrialism. 'The disintegration and transformation of bourgeois society is the dynamic centre of the present world situation.'

Pointing out that Christianity is a faith and movement far older than bourgeois society, and that by the very nature of its message it must seek to transcend—as in fact it has hitherto succeeded in doing—every particular historical situation, Dr. TILLICH describes its rôle to-day as one both of adaptation to, and transcendence over, the present world situation. And he claims that Christianity in creating the Ecumenical Movement has confronted the nationalistic opposition to the religious and cultural unification of mankind, and has at the same time created the only world unity that exists in the present 'demonic' disruption of humanity.

From an essay full of bold and impressive historical generalizations we turn to Dr. GREENE's

[1] Nisbet; 10s. net.

discussion of some familiar contemporary attitudes to religion and Christianity, and in particular the sophisticated naturalism of John Dewey, Ernest Nagel, and Sidney Hook, and the humanism expressed by R. P. Blackmur. Against naturalists and humanists he expounds and defends the concepts of the supernatural and revelation, and would also set in a reasonable light such a doctrine as that of original sin.

The third essayist, Dr. THOMAS, begins by saying that in some cases it is not the influence of a naturalistic or humanistic philosophy but ignorance or misunderstanding of the Christian faith that keeps men from subscribing to that faith. Accordingly, he seeks to restate the central affirmations of Christianity and their relevance to human need.

This is the essay of the book that the ordinary Christian preacher will find the most helpful. It presents in brief compass a thoughtful exposition from a modern conservative standpoint of the main Christian doctrines. Conservative, and yet liberal; for, to select an instance, we find Dr. THOMAS inclined to take the Resurrection appearances in a spiritual rather than a physical sense, yet affirming their reality and their consequent influence upon the disciples' faith in the great victory God had wrought through Christ on the Cross.

In the fourth essay Dr. AUBREY tries to show how Christianity can meet the social problem of to-day. He takes as his key words: security, unity, freedom, and significance. The first three key words readily suggest questions that are in our minds at this time; the question raised by the fourth is, How are men to be given a sense of meaning in life?

The concluding essay, by Dr. KNOX, considers Jesus' demands on the individual as contrasted with His message for society, dealt with in the preceding essay. More particularly, it deals with the individual's answer in the light of Christianity to the questions: What has God called me to be and do? How can I fulfil that vocation? The essayist concludes by noting that there is a sense in which the phrase, 'individual Christian,' is self-contradictory, for an individual is Christian in virtue of his membership of an historical community, the Holy Catholic Church.

'When we say, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," what we really mean is not that we believe in the Church itself in any absolute sense but that we believe in the God who has made Himself known to us in the Church—the God whom Christ revealed. We belong to the Body of Christ because we have been laid hold on by Christ. We feel a deeper devotion to this community than to any other human society because we have found God there, or rather God has found us there.'

Biblical Sacramental Theory.

BY PRINCIPAL W. ROBINSON, M.A., B.Sc., D.D., OVERDALE COLLEGE, SELLY OAK.

ON any simple unprejudiced reading of the New Testament it is plain that Christianity began as a sacramental religion; that is, there were certain definite acts employing *material* media to which were related *spiritual* benefits. This fact was scarcely disputed before the time of Wycliffe, and not seriously disputed before the Reformation, and then not by the greater Reformers, with the possible exception of Zwingli. From the sixteenth century onwards there were growing tendencies to ignore the fact with a complete denial of it in the case of the Quakers. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries incipient evangelicalism and pietism were ever lurking in the background, but both Calvinism and Lutheranism and even Free Church life in England remained in a very real sense sacramental religions. It was only in the nineteenth century that 'sacramentalist' (often quite wrongly 'sacramentarian'[1]) became a term of abuse on the lips of evangelicals, and more so after the rise of the Oxford Movement and the rapid spread of the Roman Church after Catholic emancipation.

With the rise of the critical period, the basic assumption that Christianity began as a sacramental religion came to be denied on critical grounds. This finally developed into the Liberal Protestantism of the Harnackian school, with its

[1] Strictly speaking, the term 'sacramentarian' was applied in the sixteenth century to those who took a 'low' view of the sacraments, and was especially applied by Calvinists to Zwinglians.

familiar distinction between the religion *of* Jesus and the religion *about* Jesus.[1] Even within Harnack's day this system received somewhat of a shock from the work of the Eschatological School headed by Johannes Weiss and seconded by scholars like Loisy and Schweitzer;[2] as well as from the work of the more extreme School of Reitzenstein and Bousset,[3] who acknowledged fully that Paul at least was a sacramentalist, but claimed that he had perverted original Christianity by borrowings from the Mystery Religions. At least it was seen that the simplification of the New Testament which set forth Christianity as a prophetic-ethical religion, perverted later, in the Primitive Catholic period, by Hellenic ideas and practices, was by no means so simple as it appeared. The problem was much more complex. Yet, even so, by the turn of the century there had developed in this country, both in fundamentalist and critical circles, a type of Protestant Christianity which might not unfairly be called non-sacramental, and which was inclined to confuse sacramentalism with ritualism. To this day there are numbers of Free Church lay people to whom the sacraments mean little if anything at all, and there are still many Free Church ministers who take a pride in declaring that they are not sacramentalists, shunning the word as if it denoted some fell disease, and certainly regarding it as denoting something anti-spiritual.

There were, however, other voices to be heard within the Presbyterian and Free Churches. In 1891 William Milligan, Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen, in his Baird Lectures,[4] had contended for the sacramental nature of Christianity, especially in relation to the Eucharist; whilst a little later C. A. Briggs of Union Theological Seminary, New York, moved in the same direction.[5] The work of P. T. Forsyth is now being seen in its true perspective and magnitude. In 1917 he published his book *The Church and the Sacraments*, containing the chapter by his colleague, Professor Andrews, which had previously appeared in *The Expositor*, on 'The Place of the Sacraments in the Teaching of St. Paul.' To many Free Churchmen this book came as little less than a shock. In the main it was a neglected work. Forsyth was before his time. It was hardly realised, even by scholars, how prophetic his work was of much that was to follow in the next twenty years in the fields of both Old and New Testament criticism and exegesis. At his death he had scarcely a disciple in the Free Churches. His chief disciple was the Anglican, Canon J. K. Mozley, who wrote his obituary in *The Expositor*.

In the two decades which have followed since he did his chief work, the situation has entirely changed in the fields of Old and New Testament study. The work of Form-Criticism has been significant, but even more significant has been the general recognition of the essential eschatological nature of both Jewish and Christian thought and the realization that the New Testament, although written in Hellenistic Greek, is shot through and through with Hebrew modes of thought. The result of this is that there are few scholars to-day, whether belonging to the Reformed, Lutheran, or Free Church traditions, who fail to recognize the proposition stated at the outset of this essay, 'that Christianity began as a sacramental religion,' and also to recognize that this is not to be explained by borrowings from the Hellenistic world to which it came as a missionary religion.[6]

What, then, was the reason for the rise of that peculiar kind of Protestantism (so different from the classical Protestantism of either Calvin or Luther) which came to regard Christianity as non-sacramental and sacramentalism as something unspiritual? Was the instinct sound which prompted it? I want to suggest that, although it was a wrong-headed attitude which has led to great impoverishment in Presbyterian and Free Church life, there was a sense in which the instinct was sound. My thesis is related to the development of sacramental theory in the Catholic Church, and illustrated in the main by reference to the Eucharist. It depends upon the assertion, now admitted by more and more scholars, that original sacramental theory and practice in Christianity derives from Jewish and not from Greek sources.[7] Hebrew categories of thought were *dynamic* rather than *static*, they had to do with *action* rather than with *presence* in the metaphysical sense. They were in no sense *theosophic*, which was the character of much Greek thought. Time and eternity were not opposites as they were for the Greek. In some sense eternity could be and was fulfilled in time. Hence the essential eschatological nature of Hebrew thought.[8] The

[1] See Harnack, *What is Christianity?*

[2] See Loisy, *The Gospel and the Church*, and Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*.

[3] See Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, and Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*.

[4] *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*.

[5] See his *Church Unity*.

[6] This is illustrated by the works of such scholars as M. Dibelius, R. Bultmann, C. H. Dodd, T. W. Manson, E. F. Scott, N. Micklem, Newton Flew, W. Manson, H. Gressmann, H. Gunkel, Wheeler Robinson, H. H. Rowley, Vincent Taylor, Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, and many others.

[7] See my article on 'Christian Sacramental Theory and Practice' in *Theology*, May 1938.

[8] This is referred to by Gregory Dix in his monumental work, *The Shape of the Liturgy*.

key-notions, therefore, lying behind Hebrew and primitive Christian sacramental theory and practice are 'personal,' 'ethical,' and 'concrete' as over against 'mechanical,' 'legal' and 'abstract mystical.' With the process of time, as the root from which Christianity had sprung was forgotten, it was inevitable that Christian sacramental theory and practice should become more and more theosophic, less and less personal and prophetic, until it degenerated into something legal and almost mechanical. The process of degeneration was most rapid after the fifth century. At the time of the Reformation the Western Catholic Church had a rigid sacramental theory, based upon a metaphysical understanding which inevitably made that theory theosophic; and a sacramental practice which had little relation to ethical realities. The wonder is that the Reformation did not swing completely over to a non-sacramental conception of Christianity. It was only saved from doing so by the place which it gave to the New Testament.

So far as the doctrine of 'the presence' in the Eucharist was concerned, apart from Zwinglian memorialism, there were in the main two alternative theories—the rigid theory of transubstantiation offered by the Roman Church, and the receptionism of Hooker. We may neglect for the moment Luther's theory of consubstantiation which was closely allied to transubstantiation, and what has been called the 'virtualism' of Calvin, a term which can only doubtfully be applied to his views. Even more doubtfully can he be called a receptionist.[1] His theory appears to have been more closely allied with that of 'identity,' found in Ignatius and Justin Martyr and later in the seventeenth-century Anglican High Churchmen, from whom he differed little except in denying the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, which mistake Luther also made. We shall get the matter clearer if we think only of the two opposing theories of transubstantiation and receptionism. The emphasis in transubstantiation is on the *objective* nature of the Sacrament which is regarded as an *opus operatum*, something which works willy-nilly regardless of the faith and spiritual attitude of the recipient, so long as the right formula is used and the right person uses it. It was this kind of thing which the non-sacramental Protestantism, referred to above, feared. To fear it in its crude form was a right Christian instinct. It was almost the only kind of sacramentalism known to Protestants of that day. On the other hand, the emphasis in receptionism is almost entirely on the *subjective* side. Almost everything is made to depend on the spiritual state of the recipient and little or nothing on the Sacrament itself. The logic of this position is that the Sacrament may be dispensed with, or at least become no more than an interesting survival of archaic ritual which may act as a 'psychological uplift,' which might even be better achieved by some modern expedient.[2] To repudiate this, as it was repudiated by the Catholic party, is also a right Christian instinct. Neither of these attitudes in their extreme forms, it appears to me, is the Biblical and primitive Christian sacramental understanding.

I have contended that the roots of primitive Christian sacramental teaching are to be found in the Old Testament. Let us look, then, at the conception of sacrifice which is found in the Old Testament, not only in the Prophets but elsewhere and even in the Pentateuch.[3] What we should now call the 'validity' of any sacrifice depended upon two things: (1) the performance of certain acts which were conceived of as *ordained by God*, (2) the spirit of the offerer. *Both* these things were essential. The meaning of the prophetic denunciations of sacrifices is not that sacrifices as such were useless and ineffectual, but that sacrifice was ineffectual apart from the spirit of the offerer. Unless a man *desired* to walk in the way of the Lord, the sacrifice was an offence to God and certainly did not mediate the grace of God to the worshipper. Old Testament scholars are now more and more agreed that this is the meaning of the most extreme denunciations of sacrifice in Amos and Jeremiah. Speaking of sacrifice, Professor Rowley says, 'Yet it was more than a token or pledge of the spirit. It was the organ of God's grace unto him (the worshipper). Of itself, it could no more convey to him the divine blessing than it could carry a valid plea for him. But when he made it the organ of his spirit, God could make it the organ of His approach to the offerer, and by the touch of His Spirit upon man's could cleanse him in the innermost springs of his being.'[4] When we look at Paul's view of the Lord's Supper given in 1 Co 10 and 11, it is clear that no merely 'memorialist' or 'receptionist' view will fit the teaching. The Sacrament is a memorial of Christ's death, but it is more than a memorial. He tells us plainly that whoever eats and drinks unworthily is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.[5] Here he

[1] See *The Christian Institutes*, Bk. IV. chs. xvii., xviii.

[2] The matter is well illustrated by the fact that hymns like Bernard's 'Jesus, Thou Joy of loving hearts' and Watts' 'When I survey the wondrous Cross,' both written for the Lord's Supper, could be sung on any occasion.

[3] See H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, 109 ff., 117 ff., 165 ff., to which I owe much of what follows.

[4] *Ib.* 167.

[5] 1 Co 11^{27}.

obviously means that whoever partakes in the wrong spirit, instead of receiving the benefits, incurs the guilt of those who crucified the Lord. 'It is not merely that without the right spirit he fails to appropriate the blessing which might be his; he adds to his guilt and positively injures himself.[1] Lying behind this teaching is the essential meaning of sacrifice in the Old Testament. We need look no further afield for the substance of it. The Sacrament is God's organ for conveying grace, but it is not as an *opus operatum* that it conveys grace, that is, as something independent of the spirit of the worshipper.[2]

This is an objective-subjective view of sacrifice and sacrament. If it be objected that too much is made to depend on the subjective element while the objective sinks into the background, I would maintain that this is not so. If we think of the Sacrament as the means which *God has ordained* (and here the word 'ordinance' has some significance) for the conveying of grace, there is no detracting from its objective character if we also think of it as the means which God has ordained *under conditions*. And those conditions are fulfilled when the worshipper in spirit joins himself to the Sacrament, to that which it symbolizes, the sacrificial death of our Lord; in other words, when he 'discerns the Lord's body.' This is as objective as any view of the Sacrament as an *opus operatum*, whilst at the same time it preserves all that the receptionists desired to preserve, but which they were able to preserve only by denying the objectivity of the Sacrament. If we accept this view it probably means that we shall have to come to realize that a term like 'real presence' is inadequate for expressing the true meaning, being somewhat too theosophic; and shall have to choose rather to speak of the 'real action' of God in the sacraments. It will also mean, so far as Baptism and the Eucharist are concerned, that the problem of the ordaining of these sacraments by our Lord is more important than we had supposed it to be. But on that problem New Testament scholarship is shedding some light. It will further mean, from the Protestant side, that we shall have to reconsider the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist. It was here that the Reformers perhaps made their one fundamental mistake in their eucharistic teaching. This view should also have some effect on the solution of the question of infant Baptism as over against believers' Baptism. But these are questions I will not enter into here. I have merely wanted in this article to examine that type of Protestant thinking which still regards sacraments as unspiritual things, and that type of Catholic teaching which thinks that, once one begins to emphasize the spirit of the worshipper, one has taken the objectivity out of the Sacrament and that such objectivity can only be preserved by a view which makes the Sacrament an *opus operatum*.

[1] H. H. Rowley, *op. cit.*, 169.

[2] The true *opus operatum* is the Cross, which is God's act in which He offers Himself. In the sacrifice of the Cross our Lord is both Priest and Victim. He is the offerer and that which is offered. Here the two elements of the act ordained by God and the spirit of the offerer are combined in One Person who both offers the sacrifice and *is* the sacrifice. In the Eucharist this sacrifice, which is final and once-for-all ('the finished work of Christ,' to use the classical Protestant expression), is not repeated, but it is re-called by the worshippers and re-presented. They not only plead it, but identify themselves with it. Hence the emphasis which must be laid on the spirit of the worshipper. Paul refers positively to this identification in connexion with the sacrament of Baptism (Ro 6^{1-11}). It is only negatively that he refers to it in relation to the Eucharist (1 Co 11^{27-29}), but there is no reason to suppose that he did not hold the positive side as well.

Literature.

DR. GOSSIP'S BOOK ON PRAYER.

A NEW book by Dr. A. J. Gossip is always an event, for everything he writes is certain to be original, vivid, and stimulating. *In the Secret Place of the Most High* (Independent Press; 8s. 6d. net) is sub-titled 'Some Studies in Prayer,' and presents us with the distilled wisdom of a master of the devotional life who never forgets that he is first and last a preacher.

Only Dr. Gossip could have written this book, and his name on the title page is quite superfluous. Every paragraph is initialled by his genius, and every chapter is signed by the authentic and irresistible Gossip style. Not only is this book a searching study of the human heart and a survey of all the reaches of the devotional life, it is great preaching as well. An instance of this may be found in the chapter entitled 'On the Characteristic Note of Christian Prayer,' where Dr. Gossip deals with Thanksgiving in prayer, and in effect preaches a sermon which is extremely relevant to our condition to-day. The book might easily have been entitled 'What We Owe to Christ,' for every chapter catches something of the flame of devotion to Him that is leaping and glowing in the writer's heart.

The reader may therefore be assured that there

is nothing hackneyed or pedestrian about even the familiar themes of the place of Confession, Adoration, or Intercession in prayer. The illustrations are copious, fresh, and clear. Some from Dr. Gossip's own experience are remarkably telling, while there is evidence of an ample acquaintance with the masters of prayer in all churches and in all lands.

Much happens by the way. Mr. Shaw is firmly dealt with for saying that 'it is the prayer and not the prayee that matters.' There is an acute discussion of the differences between the Romanist and Reformed forms of worship, with vigorous denial that the Protestant form of worship is 'too subjective, too man-centred.' A pen-picture of A. B. Davidson is very moving, as Dr. Gossip describes what prayer can be, and is, 'to a really-believing man.' But every page is alive, for Dr. Gossip is drawing all the time from a richly stored mind, and he could not be tedious even although he tried very hard. This is a book to possess.

R. J. WEDDERSPOON.

MAN AND SOCIETY IN THE N.T.

Throughout a long teaching career Dr. E. F. Scott has written many notable books on the New Testament. There is now a new book in the same field from his pen entitled *Man and Society in the New Testament* (Scribners; 12s. 6d. net), marked as all its predecessors have been by intimate mastery of the New Testament content and by admirable lucidity of statement. The concern of this new book is with the social aspects of New Testament thought. The New Testament teaching according to Dr. Scott revolves on two poles—the fact of God and the fact of human personality. Ancient religion was all communal, but Jesus extricated man from the depersonalizing threat in this, by revealing the God in whom each individual can find a true value and destiny. There was a social consequence of this at once in terms of the fellowship of the Church. Here the law of love, individually willed, became the sustaining bond. Circumstances of the time caused the Church to take upon it the character of a self-contained society, yet Jesus meant that this narrower fellowship should foreshadow a larger one. The Church was never meant to be severed from the general life of the world, and from this point of view the conjunction of Church and State under Constantine, though full of danger, did open an opportunity of discovering the wider bearings upon the manifold of life of the faith engendered by the gospel. Nevertheless, the insistence of the New Testament itself must be asserted, and especially so in view of the communal trends of our time. Christianity is not an ethic or a political system but a religion. The Christian position is that it is the men in their personal lives who need to be redeemed; when they are changed into new men all the rest will follow. It was by the unrelenting witness to this that the New Testament became the most revolutionary of books. It has been the driving force, during the centuries, in social change, because it puts the person above every order or system, claiming for him the right to realize his own life in and for God and therefore for his fellows.

Dr. Scott, while bidding us find the solution of our urgent present-day problems in the New Testament, holds strongly that its social teaching has been often misunderstood. Planning of society was remote from the purpose of Jesus. But our obsession with planning has had ominous tendencies. Our new philosophies belittle personality; the community is regarded as self-contained, and its progress defined in terms of the material; furthermore the peace, justice, and brotherhood we are envisaging are involving our society in compulsive measures which threaten to suppress the liberty and dignity of persons. Over against this must be put the Christian purpose for life. Its plan for the creation of community is the restoration of man to God. Our progress and culture will go for little unless each man knows in his own person an eternal good given freely of God. Then, under any system as it arises from time to time, man will seek not of constraint but willingly the true welfare of his neighbour.

This is his service for the Christian hope of a society that will be truly unified because its bonds are the inward sympathy of God-apprehended souls. The resurrection of the community of mankind begins and ends with the individual entering into God's love and will. This is the final word of the New Testament upon our manifold social problems.

In Dr. Scott's bountiful and pungent exposition there is much that calls to mind a half-century-old book, Harnack's 'What is Christianity?' But it is Harnack in developed and richer form. All that Dr. Scott says upon Christianity as a religion, and upon the gospel as a discovery and exaltation of the personal life, is said notably. His insistence that any failure in this witness by the Church would be treason to her commission will command the assent of all his readers. Perhaps, indeed, some will feel that he has elaborated this to the point of minimizing the gravity of the other side of the subject. Dr. Scott appears to state the social character of the gospel for the present in terms of the kindly charitable activity of individuals. But is this enough in our kind of world? The words 'social' and 'communal' seem to infect Dr. Scott with all sorts of emotional irritants! But may not the search for an order, social, political, and economic, be made a Christian concern in the sense that it may uphold more fruitfully the individual in his good will?

It is precisely because her message is concerned with persons, with the individual as a child of God, that the Church must keep turning and applying her serious thinking to all the conditions in which personal life is set. To say that if only there were enough Christians going about the place all would be well is to by-pass essential parts of the Christian road. Let it be said, however (even if this criticism holds), that as an unfolding of the content of New Testament religion this book is full of treasure both for the preacher and for

the theologian. It is exposition, scholarly and evangelical, of central issues. J. MACLEOD.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

The main trouble about Histories of Philosophy has been that if they are readable they are too slight to be of any great value; if they are reliable they are almost quite unreadable. 'Ueberweg'—the very name makes one shudder. Lord Russell has crowned a notable series of books and articles expounding his own philosophy by issuing this portly volume, *History of Western Philosophy* (Allen and Unwin; 21s. net). It is notable in being neither slight nor unreadable. The literary style is charming, and the author contrives to make deep problems intelligible, and on the whole to do justice to the many philosophers whose views he expounds. So easy is the presentation of tough matter that the reader is carried on almost fascinated. As the sub-title or rather the continuation of the title indicates, Lord Russell covers the long period 'from the earliest times to the present day.' Also part of the full title is (philosophy's) 'connection with political and social circumstances.' Undoubtedly that is not merely interesting but quite important, and some of the best sections of the work are those depicting the political and social environment of the individual thinkers. One may doubt as to whether there is uniform excellence, and in some cases as to the relevance of that environment to the philosophy produced; but in the main real light is again and again cast by the attempt to clarify the relations between a philosophy and the political and social circumstances with which it was contemporaneous. The inevitable divisions are followed—ancient, mediaeval, and modern.

To speak quite generally, it is obvious that none but a philosopher can write a history of philosophy, and that, strive as he may, not only his estimate but his account of philosophers to which he is personally opposed, must more or less fail to be quite just or 'objective.' In the light of Lord Russell's own 'logical analysis' pushed to extreme 'logical atomism,' how will the 'tradition' from Plato to Hegel fare? Well, here and there it fares very badly; on the other hand, Lord Russell pleasantly surprises one by the sincere effort he undoubtedly makes to be fair. To be more specific. One wonders where the author got real material for his lengthy treatment of Democritus of whom little is known, and of whose teaching little more is known. So, too, one wonders on what real grounds he can so definitely impute 'motives' to Socrates, whose real life and opinions and activity have so largely and for so long been matters of uncertain discussions. The account of Plato suffers, Lord Russell dealing with only part of his writings. That fault is repeated in the modern section in the case of Bergson, whose last and important work is not even mentioned. One, of course, must make allowances; in a work of such colossal sweep, omissions which will seem to somebody else very regrettable, are probably inevitable.

Coming to modern philosophy, among many excellencies one finds some defects. Few will be persuaded that the account of Kant is adequate. Some will be surprised that that of Leibnitz is not better, because Lord Russell in another work has dealt with that thinker.

But least satisfying is the last section dealing with more recent philosophy. The attempt at anything which could be called a 'history' seems to be quietly abandoned. Only James, Bergson, and Dewey are dealt with. The refutation of Pragmatism is convincing but hardly necessary at such length. It was sufficiently refuted in a *bon mot* by 'George Birmingham'—'a lie is true if it works.' One is grateful for the exposition and criticism of Dewey. Here the author gets in his own philosophy. One is a little pained that Gentile and Croce receive no mention. Instead of those closing chapters which give the impression that Lord Russell is more arbitrary than one is sure he really is, an exposition of recent trends in philosophy might have been more useful.

The author concludes with a warning against any tendency to take an attitude of irreverence towards the cosmos. It is as timely as it is well-said. Only is it not rather reminiscent of the close of Ecclesiastes? On Lord Russell's own philosophy can there be either a cosmos or reverence?

W. D. NIVEN.

THEOLOGICAL TRAINING IN INDIA.

The Christian Minister in India: His Vocation and Training (Lutterworth Press; 8s. 6d. net) is based on a survey of theological training for the Indian ministry that was carried out by the National Christian Council of India. Mr. C. W. Ranson, till recently one of the Secretaries of that Council, has prepared this British edition of the Indian Report in the hope that by its means a deeper and more widespread concern for the training of the ministry of the Indian Church may be created in this country. No subject can be more vital for the future of the Indian Church than this and it is, therefore, greatly to be desired that many who recognize the significance for the world of the conversion of India should make themselves acquainted with this important and authoritative document.

The hopes—and fears—that gather about India at the present juncture must make it plain to us all that the strengthening of the leadership of the Indian Church is more than ever an urgent necessity. Fifteen years ago when the Lindsay Commission reported on Christian Higher Education in India the need for drastic improvement in theological training was evident to the members of the Commission but this subject lay outside their consideration. The possibility of relating the education that the Christian Colleges provide to this particular department of study was, indeed, in the minds of some of the members of that Commission but it could not be brought within the scope of their investigation. This

possibility does not appear to have been considered in connexion with the survey which Mr. Ranson describes. Perhaps as the Colleges become increasingly—as appears likely—Colleges primarily for Christian students, their relation to theological training may yet come under review.

The chaos in theological training that missionary individualism had created in India has gradually been coming under control in recent years. So long as English remains the lingua franca of the land—though that may not continue much longer—there will have to be some Training Colleges that use that language. There are five at present. But the future of this kind of education is, and should be, with the vernaculars. One reason why English is still used is the lack of suitable textbooks in the various vernaculars. That means that progress in theological training must go along with the production of good Christian literature in all the major languages. Work for Christian literature must be for many years in consequence a first priority for both foreign missions and the Indian Church. The Indian pastor must be able to give expression freely and accurately in his own language to the Christian truths by which his people live and grow.

Let no one suppose that a vocabulary of theology cannot be provided in the Indian vernaculars. These are not primitive languages but languages with a long history and a varied literature centuries old. In a footnote Mr. Ranson quotes some one 'who has had experience as a theological teacher in England and in India' as advocating the teaching of theology 'in a vernacular jargon.' Mr. Ranson, I am sure, will repudiate the word 'jargon' as applied to any Indian language. Languages such as Tamil, Bengali, and Marathi can only be so described by one who is unacquainted with the scope and richness of the literatures that these languages possess. If in them Tukaram three hundred years ago and Tagore to-day could speak and sing with power and abundance out of their deep hearts, then surely they can be kindled to a new splendour on the lips of Christian men and women.

Another desideratum if this end is to be fully achieved is that the churches should co-operate in such training. Already co-operation in theological teaching is beginning, and the barriers between the churches that derive from the Church of England and the other churches are being broken down even in this sphere where co-operation might be expected to be particularly difficult. In each of the language areas mentioned above union Training Colleges of this comprehensive type are either in actual operation or are being projected.

Of these and other matters that are involved in plans for the training of the Christian ministry this book gives a full and stimulating account. Mr. Ranson presents the situation and its demands with knowledge and skill. It may well be the case, as he says, that the resolve to make the training of the ministry the pivot of Christian strategy for churches and missions in post-war India will prove 'the one great choice which, being honoured and held to, carries all the rest in the end and carries them high.'

NICOL MACNICOL.

THESE DENOMINATIONS.

In *These Denominations* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net) the Director of Religious Education for the Diocese of Sheffield, Canon H. G. G. Herklots, has provided a book wholly to be commended as a swift, scholarly, easily read review of the history behind the present position and outlook of the churches, equally serviceable as an introduction to the subject and as a statement of the kind of outlook which is wholesome and hopeful. It is brightly yet finely written, at once bland and earnest, profound, candid, and charitable.

He seems to agree with Streeter's view that it was not in the first but in the second century that the episcopal order became general. He notes that the Enabling Act of 1919 has not given to the Church of England spiritual freedom, though, if the Crown appoints the Bishops, the Archbishop crowns the King. He quotes Professor Brogan's words: 'The Church of England may only be the church which the majority of English people stay away from. But they want it to be there to stay away from; it is their spiritual home whenever (which is not very often) they feel they want one.' Thus his admiration of the compromise and inclusiveness which marks the Anglican Communion is not uncritical, and his treatment of other churches is knowledgeable and sympathetic.

A Scotsman may make the small critical point that it is not quite happily expressed to say that the Westminster Confession was written 'by English clergy.' The Committee in charge was eight of the English members of the Assembly and all six of the Scots commissioners, two of whom were laymen. And in connexion with the distinction between the idea of a comprehensive institution, and a 'gathered church' of definite Christians it might perhaps be maintained that the Church of Scotland has always been unhappy that this distinction is possible or necessary. Its constitution is of a 'gathered' church, for mere adherents have no votes in its democracy.

R. W. STEWART.

RELIGION AND LAW.

The publication of *Studies in Biblical Law*, by Dr. David Daube (Cambridge University Press; 21s. net), forms a notable contribution to the subject of the relation between Religion and Law. The book is composed of five essays, to which copious notes are added, and there is an extensive index.

The ordinary reader will be more interested in the first, third, and fourth essays. Yet, even although the other two essays are more technical, there is nothing in the book which does not aid our understanding of the Bible.

The first essay is 'Law in the Narratives.' Dr. Daube takes up the dictum that religion is prior to law in the sense that legal precepts were

originally religious. That view, he asserts, is an over-simplification. He then develops the view that legal concepts frequently determine theological ideas. One of his illustrations is taken from the story of Moses' glimpse of the Promised Land. Dr. Daube suggests that behind this viewing of the landscape there is a legal concept, namely, that it was a legally valid method of entering into possession of land by looking it over.

In the third essay, '*Lex Talionis*,' Dr. Daube claims that even in the practice of retaliation there is an element of compensation. For example, the 'avenger of blood' does not merely slay the murderer. By putting the murderer to death, there is taken from him the power he had over his victim. The victim's soul is now restored to his family. 'Vengeance is compensation.'

The fourth essay is 'Communal Responsibility.' In this Dr. Daube distinguishes between 'Communal Responsibility,' 'Communal Merit,' and, what he calls 'Ruler Responsibility.' The discussion which follows is particularly illuminating. It deals with ideas operative in the minds of those who took an active part in affairs at times of crisis. What were the thoughts in Abraham's mind when he pleads that Sodom and Gomorrah should be spared? What principle was involved when the prophets said that owing to the wickedness of the king Israel should be punished? Or, how far does the salvation procured by Jesus depend on 'ruler reward' or 'communal merit' (in both cases the salvation being dependent on Jesus)?

The remaining two essays are 'Codes and Codas' and '*Summum Ius—Summa Iniuria*.' These are slightly more technical but very interesting in themselves.

This work is singularly lucid, and in parts almost brilliantly written. It is lit up, now and then, with flashes of humour. It forms a very helpful approach to a clear understanding of the mentality of the men and women we meet on the pages of the Bible. Those who are desirous of 'getting inside' the characters in the Old Testament will be richly rewarded by reading this book.

JAMES WOOD.

For the Church Member (Independent Press; 2s. net) is an excellent little booklet for young Congregationalists by the Rev. John Marsh, M.A., Lecturer in Bible Studies, Mansfield College, Oxford. He writes to show them something of the spiritual heritage into which they have entered; what it means to belong to the Church; what duties are laid upon those who would be Christians in strong earnest; how they ought to comport themselves as citizens, etc. Prayers for all occasions and practical hints for daily living are supplied, and the whole is written in a simple and anecdotal style.

'The position and status of whole-time women workers in the Church is a matter of immediate interest and concern for many Christian denominations, and it is a help, when this matter is discussed, to see it in a full historical context.' So writes Mr. F. D. Bacon in the Preface to his book, *Women in the Church* (Lutterworth Press; 8s. 6d. net). The book contains an account of the work, witness, and status of Christian women from the time of Christ to the present day, and thus gives not only a background for the consideration of the problems about the work of women in the Church but information that may help readers to a conclusion on some of these problems. Religious orders, missions, lay work and other relevant matters come under review in the historical survey, and Mr. Bacon does not shrink from a consideration of the most difficult and most urgent problem: Are women to be admitted in full status to the ordained ministry? Mr. Bacon himself takes an objective view, striving to be impartial, and he states the arguments on both sides. One of the most interesting parts of his book is found in the concluding chapters in which he gives a careful account of the extent to which churches have already thrown the ministry open to women. It is remarkable how inconsiderable is the number of female ministers in these bodies, and how much unemployment exists among the women already ordained. But the question of principle is one that is pressing itself on the minds of many of the churches, and must be settled one way or the other, and the problem of church union adds an additional note of urgency to the matter. Mr. Bacon in his interesting book has done a useful piece of work.

This brightly written little book, *Design for Rescue*, by Robert C. Walton (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net), is a course of lectures given at two Summer Conferences for sixth form girls and boys. It compares the form of the gospel story with what Bradley finds in Shakespearean tragedy, exposition, conflict, and catastrophe, a comparison that is just, since the form of tragedy is the pattern of real life. The lectures must be judged in the light of their setting. Such expressions as, 'Peter in a blue jersey and sou'wester,' and 'Mark, giving "shots" like a film of the mounting tension,' may have been effective though not to everyone's taste. It is doubtful if the technical sense of the word 'comedy' can ever crowd out the ordinary sense it has for a general audience, and therefore it is not suitable for conveying the idea in the author's mind when he speaks of turning the tragedy of the Cross into a comedy. 'God's Son' is not a happy expression or a better translation than King James gives of the Greek. At two points there seems to be slight confusion. The Pharisees are referred to as a profession rather than a party. And in the paragraph which follows the assertion that the language of the Temptation narrative is highly symbolic it is taken extremely literally.

These are, however, minor points in a vigorous treatment of the theme. The short paragraphs on the Trinity, the supra-personality of God, and the Divinity of Christ are exceedingly well done. It is perhaps odd that in a book for adolescents a theological reader will find the most philosophical passages the most satisfying.

The serious defect in the lectures is that, starting

out from the datum that Jesus is 'God's Son,' conscious of supernatural power, it develops no interest in the actual mental life of Jesus in His human career as He reacts to the changes and chances of a real human experience. One is not sure if this is the result of a theological standpoint or quite unintentional.

In *Christ and Everyman* (S.C.M.; 4s. 6d. net) friends and disciples will find selections from the Broadcast Talks of the late Dom Bernard Clements, made by Edward Shillito. They are arranged in the form of daily readings, and those who valued the teaching of this well-known and well-loved person will find all his qualities in these brief passages, his deep spirituality, his humour, and his humanity. This book will give spiritual guidance and uplift to its many readers.

Singular and Plural in St. Paul's Letters.

By the Reverend W. F. Lofthouse, D.D., Woodstock, Oxford.

Most readers of St. Paul's letters have noticed the constant and seemingly capricious transitions which he makes from the first singular to the first plural pronouns, and back again. J. H. Moulton (*Grammar of the Greek Testament*, Prolegomena, p. 86) referring to the work of K. Dick (*Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus*, 1900), speaks of the way in which 'I' and 'We' 'chased each other throughout the papyri without rhyme or reason,' and quotes Deissmann's opinion (*Theol. Rundschau*, v. 65) that St. Paul's use of the pronouns cannot be reduced to rule. Moulton himself is content to hand on the question from the grammarian to the exegete (cf. the note on *ego* in MM., *Vocab. of Gk. Test.*, 180). Milligan, in his commentary on the *Thessalonian Epistles* (Note C, 131 ff.), observes that in several Epistles St. Paul, though starting with an address from a group of persons, 'uses the first singular throughout in the body of the epistle,' but that he continues the first plural throughout the Thessalonian Epistles, suggesting in these letters a more continuous joint authorship.

E. G. Selwyn, in his new commentary on *1 Peter* (pp. 15 ff.) has raised the matter again, hinting that the sudden change from the 'We' to the 'I' passages in Th (*e.g.* 2 Th $2^{2.5}$) may be due to the fact that the two letters were actually written by one of the companions who are named in the opening sentences, probably Silvanus, and that St. Paul himself broke in with teaching which perhaps his companions did not think as appropriate as he did. St. Peter, who made much more use of Silvanus, as both Bigg and Selwyn would agree, than St. Paul made in general of Tertius (Ro 16^{22}) or any other of his amanuenses, writes in the first singular throughout. If we are to regard Silvanus as supplying the language of 1 Peter, while the Apostle supplied the general contents, we may suspect that Silvanus, if ever he acted as St. Paul's amanuensis also, was more familiar with St. Paul's expressions than with the meaning with which the Apostle clothed them in his own mind.

Whether or not we are to suppose that St. Paul's relation or attitude to his companions changed after these, his earliest Epistles, we may well consider the matter in relation to the Epistles as a whole; and when we do so, the distinction made above by Milligan will hardly be maintained, more particularly in 2 Co, Ro, Eph. In 2 Co 1, for example, the plurals definitely refer to the trio, Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy, *v.*[19]; while at *v.*[23] he deliberately returns to the singular, till $2^{14ff.}$.

1. What are the possible causes for these transitions? We may safely rule out mere caprice or irrationality. It is true that one result of the study of the papyri has been to blur certain distinctions familiar to more old-fashioned grammarians, as between aorist and imperfect; as most Hebrew commentators, at least in dealing with the later books of the Old Testament, know the temptation to blur the distinction in the use of the two Hebrew tenses. So with *eis* and *pros* on the one hand and *en* on the other (as also in modern Greek; cf. Stambul for *eis tēn polin*). It would be as unwise to claim that N.T. writers never used two grammatical expressions for one idea as to assert that all the nuances of classical Greek are preserved in the N.T. But it is a sound rule of linguistic as of literary interpretation, to give the writer the benefit of the doubt, and to assume that if he varies his use of tenses or prepositions or pronouns, he has a reason for doing so. Not that he is to be supposed to be always conscious of the reason. The writers did not lay down their pens to consider whether they should use *hina* with the indicative or the subjunctive. St. John may have been no more conscious that he was writing *eis ton kolpon* instead of *en* with the dative (Jn 1^{18}), or St. Paul,

that he was using now 'Jesus,' now 'Jesus Christ,' and now 'the Lord Jesus Christ,' than Shakespeare was when he made his characters use 'you' or 'thou.' But as E. A. Abbott points out in his elaborate treatment of Shakespeare's personal pronouns (*Shakespearian Grammar*, ed. 1877, pp. 153 ff.) there is a reason for every singular and plural, as there is doubtless in the language of the Society of Friends, or of the Yorkshireman to-day. Modern psychology, indeed, would affirm that we learn more from the unintentional than the intentional, in speech as in behaviour. There is, we may even suppose, a reason why an unwelcome conviction is expressed, now by 'I can but think,' and now by 'I cannot but think.'

With this in mind we shall hesitate to class the Pauline plurals with plurals of 'majesty,' the literary or the editorial. If the Thessalonian Epistles furnished the rule and not the exception for the rest, we might take refuge in such hastily built shelters. But will they serve when we take note of the actual distribution of singular and plural? In Gal, the sing. is about three times as common as the pl.; in 1 Co about twice as common; in 2 Co the pl. predominates; and so in Ro, if we omit chs. 15 and 16. In Eph, the pl. exceeds the sing., as, in Ph, the sing. exceeds the pl.; while the pl. appears in a predominantly sing. passage in *e.g.* 1 Co 9^{1-6}, in Ph 3^{13-21} the pl. gradually edges out the sing.

2. There is clearly nothing for it but to examine the passages individually. In a brief article like the present, only a few instances can be actually selected; but I think these will make clear the conclusion which a more exhaustive enumeration would press home, viz., that there is a reason in every case (whether St. Paul was conscious of it or not) why the sing. or the pl. is used; and that when the sing. is used, St. Paul is referring to his own life and personal experiences and convictions, or definitely taking his stand, in argument, in warning, in teaching, or in irony or in pleading, in contrast to his hearers. As C. H. Dodd expresses it (*Romans*, 107): 'Paul rarely if ever says "I" unless he is really speaking of himself personally, even if he means to generalize from the particular instance.' Few of the great letter writers have been readier than St. Paul to speak of themselves personally and with a greater variety of personal nuance.

When, on the other hand, he uses the pl., he is identifying himself either with some or all of the group whom he mentions at the beginning or the end of the letter in question, or with his readers in general, or with the consciousness of the whole Christian community. If the first of these alternatives is in point, it must be remembered that St. Paul sometimes referred to a larger number of companions at the end of his letters than at the beginning: cf. 1 Co 1^{1} 16^{19}, Ph 1^{1} 4^{21f}, Col 1^{1} $4^{10ff.}$. In Gal, where there are no salutations at the close, St. Paul joins with him, in 1^{2}, 'all the brethren.' But too much stress cannot be laid on this; in 2 Co, 'all the saints' are mentioned at the beginning and the end.

3. To turn then to some individual instances. First, there are the common phrases, personal, with a touch of authority, where the sing. is always used; 'I would not have you ignorant,' 'I make known unto you,' and the like. So, 'I thank,' though sometimes the pl. is found here. In this connexion, it is useful to notice the Apostle's use of the verb to boast or glory, which occurs with striking frequency in 2 Co; elsewhere only in Ro 5^{3}, 1 Co $1^{29.31}$ 3^{21} 4^{7} 13^{3} (?), Gal $6^{13f.}$, 2 Th 1^{4}. The noun occurs, outside 2 Co, 1 Co 5^{6} $9^{15f.}$, Ph 1^{26} 2^{16}, in this connexion. That the 'natural man' in St. Paul was prone to boasting is clear; but all the boasting which the Apostle allows to himself is the pride in the despised and repulsive Cross on which his Master had been done to shameful death; the glory in the churches, and even in tribulation, he insists on sharing with the rest. The use of sing. and pl. here is specially suggestive. Equally natural is the sing. in the autobiographical passages, Gal $2^{1ff.}$ $4^{13ff.}$; cf. also 1 Co $2^{1ff.}$ $11^{2ff.}$ $15^{8ff.}$. For most of 1 Co 13 he seems to forget his readers altogether, save for the one pl. in *v.*^{12}. So in 2 Co 11^{1-12} 12 13^{1-4}, Ro 9^{1} and naturally 15 and 16 *passim*. Eph 3^{1-4} 6^{19-21} give us the sing., for even if Eph is a circular letter, St. Paul cannot refrain from writing as to friends. To the above list we may add 1 Th 2^{18}; the hindrance was felt by the group, but with special intensity by the Apostle himself.

4. There are indeed numbers of instances of the pl. which cause us no trouble. In some, the Apostle is plainly identifying his experiences with that of the church to which he writes; and if he idealizes, who shall blame him? For instance, Gal 1^{4} 4^{3} 6^{9}, 1 Co 9^{10} 11^{16}; in 2 Co the pl. is mostly absent; but it returns in Ro 4^{1-24} $5^{1ff.}$ 6^{15} (note the following 2nd pers. plurals) 13^{12} 14^{8}; and Eph *passim*. There is another set of passages where he is clearly thinking of himself as one of the group, smaller or larger; most of the passages in 1 and 2 Th, 1 Co 1^{23}, Ro 10^{8}. (In Eph there are no instances of this, just as there is no common salutation.) So with Ph 3^{17} (following sing.), Col 1^{3}. This is made explicit in 2 Co 1^{19}; cf. 7^{6} 8^{23} 12^{18}, where the change from sing. to pl. is noteworthy but quite intelligible.

At times, especially in Ro, we find what may be called the dialectical use of the pronouns, sing. and pl. On occasion, St. Paul imagines himself conducting his defence or debating his case; he then

uses the sing. 7^{1} 9^{19} $10^{18f.}$ 11^{11}. At other times he is rather lecturing a class, as when he held a kind of 'seminar' in the 'school of one Tyrannus' at Ephesus (Ac 19^{9}). Here it is the 1st pl. which is appropriate; Ro $3^{9.\ 28.\ 31}$ $4^{1.\ 9}$ 6^{1} 8^{31} $9^{14.\ 30}$. Sometimes he singles out an imaginary opponent and cross-questions him; 'thou,' Ro 2^{3} 9^{20} 11^{17} $14^{4.\ 22}$. In 2 Co $5^{16f.}$ he uses the 1st pl. rather than the 2nd; 'we know no man after the flesh'—as a mere human being; he goes on, 'even if this is how we have known Christ,' when the 1st sing. might have been looked for; of how many of his readers could this be said? But with a touch of his characteristic courtesy he places them on his own level. In Gal $2^{14ff.}$ and perhaps ^{17}, we have the substance of St. Paul's actual reply to St. Peter at Antioch; in verses $^{19ff.}$ he passes on to his own personal experience, which had doubtless deepened in the intervening years (see Lightfoot's note on $v.^{14}$ and Duncan, *Galatians*, 63). St. Paul wrote as he spoke; he was always conscious of his audience, whether he pushed them from him or gathered them round him. Readers of F. H. Bradley's *Appearance and Reality* may have noticed the same changes from 'we' to 'you' and 'I'; perhaps if English could pass with the ease of Greek from the sing. to the pl. in the 2nd person (there is no parallel in French or German or other modern languages) we might have found this further Pauline transition in Bradley's pages.

5. But there are a number of places which demand further comment. In the Thessalonian Epistles, in spite of the prevailing use of the pl., St. Paul refers definitely to his personal desire to visit the Church (1 Th 2^{18}), to his wish that the letter should be read to the entire community (5^{27}), and to his personal signature (2 Th 3^{17}). For 2 Th 2^{5} Selwyn's view referred to above seems hardly necessary; doubtless at Thessalonica, as at Lystra, St. Paul was the chief speaker. In 1 Th 3^{5}, the only other passage in the Thessalonian Epistles in which the sing. occurs, 'when *I* could no longer forbear' repeats the 'when *we* could no longer forbear' of $v.^{1}$, where he is thinking of the anxiety of the little group which led to the despatch of Timothy; later, the recollection of his own anxiety comes over him. In Gal 1^{9} the passage from the pl. to the sing. though striking, is quite intelligible, in view of the sing. in $v.^{6}$.

6. Yet again, there are instances of the rapid transition from sing. to pl., or of the sing. where we should have looked for the pl. and *vice versa*, more perplexing than the above. Some of these we may now consider. In 1 Co 6^{15}, for instance, where the 1st pl. might have seemed natural, St. Paul takes the more personal attitude; 'Your bodies are the members of Christ; very well; am *I*, then, acting on this principle, to make the members of Christ the members of a harlot?' Surely a masterpiece of tact. In 8^{1} there is a characteristic touch of irony; but blunted, as St. Paul includes himself in his gibe. So, in $v.^{8}$ he lays down a rule in the 1st pl., but applies it at once in the 2nd pl., with a caution specially needed by his hearers; in $10^{30f.}$ the note of personal defence is followed by emphasis on the duty of the Church. In 2 Co $1^{23f.}$ he passes from his own personal reason for delaying his visit to Corinth, to the attitude of himself and his friends; cf. $v.^{14}$, further elaborated in $3^{1-5.\ 12}$ 5^{1-10} and even in $6^{11f.}$ But the sing. as naturally emerges when he is thinking of his own experiences as he writes, as in 7^{3-12} as opposed to $v.^{2}$. In $9^{3.\ 5}$ comes the contrast between the general purpose of the group and his own plan, as its leader, to effect it. In 10, the attitude is that of the group, the special appeal is his own ($vv.^{1.\ 2}$; contrast $^{8f.}$ with $^{7.\ 11}$). The sing. returns in the autobiographical chs. 11, 12, 13. He does not forget the group in 12^{19} or his own personal apprehensions in $v.^{20}$. He is aware of his own responsibility in $13^{1.\ 2.\ 10}$, though here, too, it is the position of the group which is nearest to his heart ($vv.^{6ff.}$).

He is the spokesman of the group rather than the commanding officer. At Antioch he will not even enforce upon Barnabas his decision that Mark should be left behind (Ac $15^{37ff.}$). Did Barnabas' refusal to break with a young man who afterwards rendered such service to the apostolic circle and to St. Paul himself (Col 4^{10}, 1 P 5^{13}; cf. 2 Ti 4^{11}), show that he understood the more reliable elements in Mark's character, or did St. Paul's stern attitude serve to bring them into the light?

This point may be illustrated, in passing, from the 'We' document of the Acts. The vision on the fateful night at Troas (ch. 16) was St. Paul's; it was for the whole of the little but recently enlarged group to decide on its meaning. Nor is there a hint in the succeeding paragraphs of the Apostle's subsequently issuing orders to his colleagues. If the decisions were his, he never reminded them of the fact. The student of the Methodist revival will observe both parallels and contrasts in John Wesley's dealings with his early Oxford friends, his societies, and his preachers.

7. In Romans, there is naturally less of any group with which the Apostle identifies himself. But in the most moving passage in the whole Epistle, 7^{7-25}, we find the autobiographical sing., and, in view of his general usage, we can hardly doubt that he means it. When he passes, in ch. 8, from struggle to victory, the sing. ($v.^{2}$) is replaced by the pl., 2nd and 1st; so in $13^{12f.}$ 14^{8}. In Eph (see above) he is thinking almost entirely of the blessings of the Christian community. The 1st sing., in $3^{1.\ 4.\ 8.\ 13f.}$, explains itself; also in 6^{19-22},

where he casts himself, in his loneliness, on his readers' sympathy. Was it because Eph was a circular letter that he did not refer to his own circle, as he does in Col $1^{3.\ 12.\ 28}$ and $4^{3f.}$, where the opening of the door is to be for the body of preachers, while his imprisonment is his own ?

In Philippians, the almost complete absence of the pl. bears out the specially intimate tone of the writer here, as he unburdens his heart to the Church he loved so deeply ; but the pl. is natural in $3^{3.\ 15}$ (where much can be learnt from the subtle change from 1st pl. to 2nd pl.) and in 3^{20}. In 3^{17}, remembering the absence of any reference to the group, it was surely modesty which passed from 'me' to 'us.'

Philemon scarcely offered an opportunity for the pl., save in the opening sentences, where St. Paul, with his characteristic courtesy, identifies Philemon himself and Archippus with his own companions. Nor need we further delay over the Pastorals, whether we regard them to any extent as Pauline or not, save to remark how clearly the pl. seems to show that behind the writer's thought of Timothy and Titus is that of the Church to which they all belonged ; 1 Ti 2^{2} 4^{10} 6^{8}, 2 Ti $1^{7ff.\ 14}$. In 1 Ti 6^{7} the pl. stands for the indefinite *on* or *man* (cf. Ro 12^{4}). In 2 Ti 4^{15}, the writer seems to be thinking of some experience which he and Timothy had shared, and in Tit 3^{14} of those disciples on whose loyalty both he and Titus could rely.

The above passages do not attempt to provide a complete enumeration. They will perhaps show, however, that there is no reason to attribute either caprice or carelessness to St. Paul in his use of sing. and pl. ; on the contrary, that his choice now of one and now of the other, whether deliberate or not, followed what we may call the rapid focussing of his mind, or the passionate sympathy in which he habitually sank his individuality in that of the group of which he was the life and soul, took on his own shoulders duties of expostulation or warning from which the best of them might have shrunk, laid bare his own inmost heart, and upheld before his hesitating and unsatisfactory followers an ideal which he insisted that they should think of as already shared by them with him. Stern and gentle, pliable and obstinate, self-assertive and yielding, concentrated on his daily communion with Christ and yet wistfully eager for the affection of his often unworthy friends, St. Paul lets us afresh into the secret of his inner life by these tiny grammatical finger-posts. Among all the paradoxes which he welcomed, this is as striking as any : needing no man, needing all men. If grammar is forced to ask the aid of exegesis, it does not, we may suspect, in dealing with St. Paul, ask in vain.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Proper Order.

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength : this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'—Mk $12^{30f.}$.

In many ways we are a peculiar people. By that I mean we in Britain often act in the opposite way to others. In most countries, for instance, motors keep to the right side of the road, whereas in our land they keep to the left. Most nations, too, count in tens and hundreds and thousands, what is called the decimal system ; we, however, don't. I guess you sometimes get all mixed up with yards and furlongs, pints and quarts, and so on. As I said, we are a queer people. One people from whom we do things differently is the Hebrew people. One may see it in a Hebrew Bible. A Hebrew Bible starts not from the front, but from the back. Also it is not read from left to right. It is read from right to left. Another thing we don't do alike is interesting. Suppose I asked you, for example, the present singular of the verb 'to be' I expect you would promptly answer, 'I am, Thou art, He is.' On the other hand, here is the order which a Hebrew boy or girl would give it, 'He is, Thou art, I am.' Actually, the difference in the order doesn't matter much. All the same the order in which we look at things in life is vastly important, and that Hebrew order suggests how we should.

Our first thought then should be this, 'He is.' I mean we should give first place to God and put His business in front of everything else. That was just what Jesus Christ told us, that the first Commandment was this, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.' God first and foremost in our love and in our life. I remember in pre-war days the Girl Guides of Poland decided to make a sort of retreat on the top of a high hill. Assisted by Boy Scouts they dragged timber and other materials up to the summit and the work was done. Then above the doorway of the hut an inscription was carved :

'There is nothing higher but God.'

And that, of course, is God's proper place. He is to be above everything else in our hearts.

Then next in order is 'Thou art,' which we may take as meaning that after God we are to study the good of others. Our Lord declared our second duty was loving our neighbour, while St. Paul said that we are to 'prefer' one another. I admit it takes a deal of doing. Still it's not impossible. Sir George Adam Smith, who was such a well-known Scottish Professor and minister, says that one of his small sons, at a time when they stayed in Glasgow and when there was a famine in India, made the following plea in his nightly prayer, 'Please God, when all the children in India have got enough to eat, and when all the children in Broomielaw have got shoes and stockings, may I keep my next penny to buy an engine.' Afterwards when that boy was an officer out in India he always sent at Christmas time Five Pounds out of his pay 'to help to give a good time,' as he put it, 'to the Broomielaw people.'

And then to go on, according to the Hebrew order we have 'I am,' so it's only then, after God and others, we're supposed to think of ourselves. Although naturally we must pay some attention to ourselves, in our selfish moments we're inclined, I'm afraid, to put No. 1 in a too prominent position and not consider others at all. One disease not included in the medical dictionary is I-strain; not eye-strain, something even more common, capital I-strain. It's a terrible trouble, isn't it? There's a verse about some one who suffered from it.

There was a little maiden once,
Who lived in days gone by,
Whose every thought and every word
Always began with 'I.'
I think, I know, I wish, I say,
I like, I want, I will;
From morn to night, from day to day,
'I' was her burden still.

I fear folk of that sort make a lot of trouble. One who was the direct opposite of that was a statesman who did a lot for South Africa, Lord Milner. It was said of him that 'he thought often of his work and his cause, much of his colleagues, never of himself.' A difficult ideal I admit. Nevertheless one worth striving after.

The Hebrew order then is surely the wiser one,

He is,
Thou art,
I am.

It's like that that we're meant to think and live.

Safely Airborne.

By the Reverend W. S. Liddle, Strood, Rochester, Kent.

'They shall mount up with wings as eagles.'—Is 40^{31}.

The great majority of journeys by air are carried through without injury to any one and end happily; yet accidents seem to have occurred constantly in recent months and occasioned so much anxiety that we are all interested in the study of the causes. There have been several different reasons revealed by inquiries into these disasters.

The most sensational of these aeroplane crashes was that of the Dutch Dakota at Copenhagen on 26th January this year, when a Swedish Prince, the grandson of King Gustav, and Miss Grace Moore, a famous American singer, as well as other less well-known people, lost their lives. It was said soon after this accident that it might have been caused by the failure to remove an 'elevator lock' before the machine took off. The 'elevator lock' is a long piece of steel which is fixed on the rudder, elevators, and ailerons of the plane whilst it is on the ground. If it was still in position when the machine took off the Pilot would be unable to have full use of the elevators. The chief control officer of the Danish Air Authorities said, 'If the steel lock had not been removed before the take-off and the steering consequently had not had full freedom of movement, this may have caused the crash.'

Life has often been spoken of as a journey; and the good life as a state to which one has to *rise*. Aristotle, that wise man of Ancient Greece, described the kind of man whom he considered good and noble and called him 'the high-minded man.' The 'high-mindedness' described by Aristotle did not however reach to anything approaching the loftiness of the Christian life. The Christ-like life is the highest type of life, and if you and I are going to reach it from the level of the ordinary standards of life on earth we shall have to 'rise' to it.

For an aeroplane to take off on a journey with the elevator lock still in position is, as we have seen, to make almost certain of disaster. In the same way those of us who are about to 'take off' on the journey of life, and especially of the good life of service to God, had better be sure that there is not an 'elevator lock' on us. 'An elevator lock on us?' you might say. And the answer is 'Yes'! There are certain temptations to which we might give way, certain habits which might so cripple our powers as to make us useless in the world, and might cause us to crash and bring shame on ourselves and on people who love us.

There is the 'lock' of selfishness. The New Testament tells of a young man who evidently had some 'good points' and who might have been of great help to Jesus. He asked how he might reach the heights of 'eternal life,' that is, life on the very highest level which can be achieved here on earth, and got the answer 'Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, . . . and come and follow me.' When the young man heard that 'he went away sorrowful.' He didn't want to give up his great wealth; his concern for himself and his great possessions kept him from rising to the heights of true comradeship with Christ. Selfishness can prevent you honouring God and serving others.

There is also the 'lock' of laziness. Very frequently school teachers have to write on Term-end Reports something like this: 'Has ability but needs to apply himself more.' We are not going to be of much use in our modern world—the working of which is going to require much technical ability—unless we do apply ourselves to our lessons and studies and training. The Book of Proverbs tells us 'the soul of the sluggard desireth, and hath nothing.' The lazy, inattentive boy at school often afterwards wishes that he had worked harder; there are so many things he desires, and can't have; so much that he would like to be able to do, and cannot.

But unwillingness to let Jesus be our guide is the greatest cause of inability to rise to the life of goodness and usefulness. A great hymn by Charles Wesley encourages people to turn to Jesus and 'rise into the life of God.' We can 'on faith's strong eagle-pinions rise.'

The Christian Year.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

A Prophet to Displaced Persons.

BY THE REVEREND E. L. ALLEN, PH.D., D.D.,
KING'S COLLEGE, NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

'As I was among the captives by the river Chebar, that the heavens were opened, and I saw visions of God.'—Ezk 1[1].

Of all the unhappy people in the world to-day, surely the unhappiest are those displaced persons whose future is so terribly uncertain. They are not wanted in the countries where they are at present, and they are not able to return to those from which they originally came. But they are only part of a much larger problem, for are there not multitudes of people, especially in the defeated countries, who are inwardly displaced? That has been shaken which was for long at the centre of their lives, and they have lost all confidence.

Yes, and even we in this country, however secure we may be in comparison with others, have suffered in many cases something of this inward displacement. It is not only those who have served overseas who have been profoundly affected by the years of war: those of us who remained at home have discarded old habits and come under new influences. Things which we used to take for granted have become subject to questioning and doubt. That being so, we ought to be able to read with fresh understanding the story of how, when Jerusalem fell, many of the Jews were uprooted from their native land and carried into exile. With their Temple in ruins far away, there was grave danger that, having lost so much, they would end by losing God Himself.

The vision described in this first chapter of Ezekiel is no mere product of fantasy; it was charged with a message to displaced persons, to be given to them by a prophet who was a displaced person himself. Judah was shaken by the catastrophe through which she had passed, but she was able to recover stability because men like Ezekiel, men who were rooted and grounded in God, came to her succour. Then as now religion drew much of its strength from its local attachments: then as now the question was, how much would remain once these were severed. A few thousand people had carried across the centuries a torch which was one day to give light to all mankind, and it was Ezekiel's mission to see to it, by the loyalty he gave and the loyalty he evoked, that it was not allowed to go out.

What then is the theme of the strange vision described in this opening chapter of the book? Through all its bizarre imagery, not always easy to interpret, runs the proclamation of an ever-present God. The prophet looks towards the north. He sees a storm-cloud gathering and sweeping over the land, lit up from time to time with vivid flashes. It is all a fit symbol of impending catastrophe. He refuses to be dismayed, he confronts the threatening cloud, and as he gazes into it, there takes shape before his eyes a chariot with a Rider. Trembling, he allows his eye to travel upwards to where that Rider sits. Amid the blazing splendour of the scene he catches a glimpse of a majestic Form in outline, and falls awe-struck to the ground.

The four creatures of that vision represent the four realms of Nature, of which man is the highest: as he is above the others, so God is above him. The wheels which can turn in every possible direction symbolize the power of God to be present wherever He may be needed. The eyes around the rim of each wheel stand for the all-seeing gaze of God: from Him nothing is hidden, and there is no situation which is not open to Him in all its details. The whole structure is animated, so that it can move as it will, free and unimpeded; nothing, that is to say, can hinder God; where His goodness prompts Him to act, there He is immediately present.

There were many cares in the hearts of those displaced persons by the Chebar, but the prophet's message is for those among them who are anxious chiefly lest the Presence which sustained them in happier days should be withdrawn from them now that they are in a strange land. He brings them the assurance that this shall not be, that He who was with them in Jerusalem will be with them here in Babylon. Nay more, He will be with them in any further changes which may be in store for this unhappy people. They can therefore defy exile and endure uncertainty, if their hearts are stayed on an ever-present God.

The message of the prophet to his people is a two-fold one. He tells them of a promise and of a claim. The promise is that God remains unchanged amid all changes in their environment and their fortune. This is the lesson which the Jew has had to learn again and again, as he has passed, a fugitive, from one land to another. He has learned to say to himself that he can never be homeless, for in the Law he has a 'portable fatherland' which is with him wherever he goes. We can go beyond that who have the assurance of Christ that He will be with us, even to the end of

the world. However the circumference of our lives may be shaken, while God is at the centre we can dwell secure.

Then the prophet makes a claim upon his people, bidding them in the new environment not to forget the old loyalties. There is something here which we need still to bear in mind. It is not always anything so serious as a removal east of Suez which seems to release a man from the obligations of his early life; transfer to a new housing-estate will sometimes do it! But mere change of place does not invalidate the allegiances of the soul, new circumstances do but provide a fresh opportunity for faithfulness. It was because some at least in Ezekiel's company saw this that they were able to keep the spiritual treasure which had been committed to them till the day came when they should share it with all mankind.

A mediæval writer tells us how the monks in a certain monastery wrote once to a spiritual leader of the time, asking for his guidance in the way to God. In return, he sent them one of his own books, recently composed, with a frontispiece so designed as to show a Face which seemed to look in every direction at once. Such was the artist's skill that, from whatever angle you fixed your eye upon it, it always seemed that its gaze was resting searchingly and directly upon you. So we are never forgotten by God: we live our lives under His continual scrutiny, and it is for us to decide whether this is blessing or judgment.

The words 'Thou God seest me'! have been used often to inspire terror, but in their original setting they are clearly suggestive of encouragement and cheer. A woman with a child, unwanted and destitute, finds the heavenly succour with her when man abandons her, and she gives thanks that God has seen her in her affliction. If we have made our wills one with God's will, then the thought that He is always present with us will be sheer joy; if we have matched ourselves against Him, it will be a threat of disaster. To know and love God is to be able, whenever life forces us to cry:

Change and decay in all around I see,

to send forth the prayer:

O Thou who changest not, abide with me.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Comfort.

'The God of all comfort; who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God. For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ.'—2 Co 1^{3-5}.

This is perhaps the most impressive statement in the New Testament of the Christian view of suffering and of the way of victory over it. It is the more impressive, because in a sense it is incidental and unintended. The Apostle is not deliberately trying to think out as from a study chair a theory about suffering which may, or may not, satisfy the questionings of the mind; he is merely transcribing into grateful words a living experience, which has in actual fact already satisfied far more than his mind; it has satisfied his whole spirit.

The first thing that impresses you is the profound awareness of God which pervades the whole passage. Paul has triumphed, is triumphing over his sufferings and distresses *through God*. Think of the trenchant universality of the phrase 'The God of *all* comfort.' He is the God of all comfort, positively, in the sense that He can reach Paul with His succouring fellowship and give him the victory in *all* situations whatsoever. But also He is the God of all comfort, negatively, in the sense that He is the only source of comfort and strength of which this can be said. There is thus no substitute for God in this matter.

Now thus to insist that God and the soul's fellowship with God are fundamental in victory over suffering may sound a very obvious homiletic platitude. So it may be, but it is very far from being a platitude in our thoughts about, and reactions to, the concrete situations of ordinary everyday life.

We try to mitigate our distress by thoughts of the many happinesses we have been privileged to enjoy at other times; or even by contemplating the worse fate which might have overtaken us, or has in fact overtaken other people. Or we set out to distract the suffering mind with all kinds of absorbing activities and exciting plans. Or we take refuge in a sort of gambler's hope that fortune's wheel must turn sooner or later in our favour. Or we rest in a kind of primitive, muddled faith that nothing can be so bad but what we can get through it somehow. Or perhaps we talk vaguely about another life where things will be put right without any consideration whether a soul which has not at least begun to find the way of its victory here, will be likely to find it instantly somewhere else. Or perhaps, becoming faintly religious, we talk about the will of God in a mood which is hardly distinguishable from fatalism. No doubt such thoughts are not without value. It is good at times to consider how much after all we have to be thankful for; to distract the mind by any legitimate expedient from brooding on its own troubles; to remind ourselves, if we can, that this life is not everything and that there is a beyond. Worldly wisdom is not to be despised, but its limitations had better be faced.

What then is the Christian wisdom of the matter? The first thing that Christian wisdom says is think about God *now*, and think about Him in connexion with this very trouble you are in. Put it to yourself, for it is true, that this suffering has within it a new pressure of the divine spirit, upon the entrances of your inner life. Understand too that the greatest gift of life is not this or that external blessing, this or that success or comfort, this or that betterment or relief of circumstance, but rather the gift of God's own presence in the soul, cleansing, enlarging, filling it with that spirit of Christ which turned even the Cross into a glory to God and a blessing to man. If that inner gift

can become yours then nothing henceforth will be able to defeat or overwhelm or impoverish your soul. Your troubles and sufferings may still seem a dark and terrible mystery to others, but to you they will be a mystery no longer wholly dark, no longer wholly terrible, for you will be discovering through them new depths in the love, new ranges in the adequacy, of God.

But it may be said, how is the spirit to be thus inwardly opened to the presence of God in the midst of its need? Part of the answer, perhaps indeed the whole of it, is suggested by Paul's words here.

First, we must put it to ourselves that the sorrow and need which have entered our life can equip us for helping and strengthening others. 'God comforteth us that we may be able to comfort them that are in any affliction, through the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God.'

This is a very simple thought, but it is very deep-going. It is only in the light of the ideal of brotherhood and service that the gifts which come to us and are denied to others can be rightly understood; the same is true of the sorrows that come to us and are withheld from others. The secret of human nature is always, somehow, love. He who loves not, lives not. The source of all bitterness is lovelessness. Self-centred thoughts, even though they be religious thoughts, even though they be thoughts of God's presence within the soul, are always sterile. Somehow the windows of the soul must be pushed open, however stiffly they may move at first, to wider horizons. Only as that is done can God's real presence and power be known. For He Himself is Love and not any other thing. He can redeem self-centredness, but He cannot comfort it.

There is only one way in which a maimed life can be put in the way of winning its victory and that is that it should come to see its suffering, however falteringly, as part of that deep and awful divine purpose which springs from the divine nature as love, the purpose that men should at all costs be a fellowship with one another and with God, and be redeemed in the end through suffering for and with one another in love. Let the sufferer offer his suffering to the great cause of human redemption. Let him see in it an equipment to sympathize, to love, to bear witness, let him in other words class it, however humbly, with the sufferings of Christ on the Cross and he has taken the first step to victory, to knowing the comforts of God within his spirit, to becoming a great soul. Suffering must first be a vocation before it can be a victory.

Yet, second, the vocation must be practically fulfilled to the farthest limit that circumstances permit; and the limit is as a rule much farther than we realize. To the burdens which seem so peculiarly, and even unjustly, ours, we must seek deliberately to add those of others. 'As the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our comfort also aboundeth through Christ.' Yes, but what are the sufferings of Christ? Surely we only dare call those sufferings the sufferings of Christ which have in some degree as their cause that same attitude of mind which took Him to the Cross, namely, an active entering into the deep need of mankind and a carrying of its burden in prayer and in uttermost self-giving?

Here indeed is the deep, astonishing wisdom of the Christian philosophy of comfort. By deliberately adding to your burden you diminish it! The natural man does not understand that. He does not understand that the only way to be lastingly comforted is to be a better man; the only way to be properly refreshed is to have the deeper nature released and not the shallower nature satisfied. And the only way to have the deeper nature released is to have some greater demand addressed to it. On the surface of our spirits there lie such things as ambition and pride and vanity and self-pity, and all the cruder instincts of our unredeemed nature, and our human friends when we are in distress often try to comfort us by ministering to them. It is well enough meant, but it achieves nothing. Far wiser was, for example, that great Christian soul, Cobden, who, when his friend Bright was prostrated by the death of his wife so that it seemed his mind would break, bade him take upon himself even more costingly than he had yet done the burden of the poor people of England and devote himself to their emancipation.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Discipline of Loneliness.

BY THE REVEREND R. LEONARD SMALL, M.A., CRAMOND.

'If I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole.'—Mk 5^{28}.

What is the worst kind of loneliness, the hardest to bear, the most testing in its discipline? Is it the loneliness of a Robinson Crusoe, shut off from all human society? Certainly no man can come through such an experience unharmed in mind and soul without the exercise of stern self-discipline. Is it the kind Niemöller knew, solitary confinement in a narrow cell, which still could not imprison the spirit of a man of disciplined faith and prayer? Is there not a worse kind of loneliness still, more testing in its grim discipline, the terrible solitariness this woman knew so well, the bitterness of being alone in a crowd? By the very nature of her trouble, bringing with it, as it did, ceremonial defilement, she had been all these years shut out of normal human fellowship and social life, and because she was thus shut out, she was also shut in with herself, to learn, if she would, those stern lessons which loneliness alone can teach.

There is *the loneliness in which the inmost issues of life must be faced.* For twelve years she had been like that, more than four thousand days of dragging weakness, constantly reminded of a handicap neither to be removed nor forgotten, four thousand nights of lonely thought, made doubly dark by hopelessness. No need to convince her that the

[1] H. H. Farmer, *The Healing Cross*, 133.

real problems are within, that all the re-ordering of the external world is futile if one's private and personal world of the inmost life is fundamentally disordered. It is the mood of the moment to fight shy of that fact, to shun nothing so much as sitting down quietly and facing up to ourselves, and to the inward issues of our own lives. We seem to dread both silence and solitariness, lest we be left alone with our thoughts. Perhaps that is one reason for the constant demand for fellowship, in the Church and elsewhere. We want to lose ourselves in the crowd, to express ourselves in some corporate activity, to spend ourselves in service, but not to face up to ourselves, alone. In the Hall of Mirrors at the Empire Exhibition of 1938 there were mirrors set at different angles all round the walls ; it was easy to get in, but hard to find a way out, for, wherever you turned, you were confronted by an image of yourself, often weirdly distorted. You walked up to it, looking for an exit, but there was no way past. Sooner or later that happens, for, turn where we will in life, before long each of us comes face to face with himself, and there is no way past. Like the Prodigal we may travel far, yet really get nowhere, till this is written : ' he came to himself.' For each of us there comes that solitary hour when loneliness teaches us by her hard discipline that the real issues are within.

There is *the loneliness in which burdens must be borne.* One wonders what the eyes of this woman were like after these twelve years. Did they hold that strange veiled look, which only the observant and understanding will notice at all, as if, away at the back of the eyes, the blinds were drawn and the windows curtained to mask the hidden depths of the heart ? What strange and secret fears must have lurked behind the curtains there, what hopes raised only to be dashed as cure after cure was tried in vain. What a burden of hurt, and deprivation, and bitterness, had to be borne, somehow, alone, for no one else could bear or even share it. It is a high art, that of bearing bravely and alone the burdens which are our private and personal property, and which cannot be thrust upon any one else. How finely common folk displayed that art, for instance, during the years of war. Young mothers, bearing a double burden of responsibility, being both father and mother to their children, living often on a sadly reduced income, heart-sick, too, with anxiety for loved ones in danger, yet putting a brave face on things and keeping the burden to themselves ; older folk, often desperately weary in body, mind, or spirit, yet refusing to give in, or to let the burden be seen ; men on service, acutely anxious for loved ones at home in greater danger than themselves, but determined not to let it impair their efficiency, or unload it on others—all these had learned the deep discipline of loneliness. That spirit is still to be found. Among the effects of a woman who had died with startling suddenness her children found a letter addressed to them, written and dated three years earlier. ' I have just been to see the doctor, after a violent heart attack, and he tells me that another may come at any time and will be fatal. I have not told any one, for I do not want to be petted and pampered for such time as may remain, nor do I want our last while together to be overshadowed by this fear in all our hearts. But when I am gone I want you to know that I knew what would happen, and was ready.' It was only then they grasped the reason for the new and deeper quality in her life, won by the discipline of loneliness in which a burden is borne.

There is *the loneliness in which decisions must be made.* How did the woman come to be there at all ? Probably she had heard of Jesus, and what she had heard stirred one last spark of hope. Should she dare to try to reach Him ? Would it mean just another disappointment ? How could she venture into such a crowd after being alone so long ? As we watch her carried hither and thither by the tide of humanity in that narrow street, yet always making her way nearer, nearer, hoping only to touch Him, unnoticed, and then slip away into loneliness again, we realize what an agony of indecision she must first have overcome, till this momentous step was taken. Most of the really great and momentous decisions of life have to be taken like that, alone. The choices that fashion conduct and character, that can determine a man's faith, and shape his destiny, are his own, made by himself alone. Others may suggest, or advise, or impel in one direction or another, but the decision, in the last resort, rests with him. ' What is life for ? Why am I here ? What shall I do with my life ? What think ye of Christ ? What shall I do with Jesus ? '—these are questions to which each must make his own answer, alone.

Alan Moorehead, in his book *Eclipse,* describes the consultations between the Service Chiefs on the eve of D-Day. On the early morning of 4th June, in view of the unpromising weather report, the first move was postponed for twenty-four hours. In the evening the leaders met again, reports were heard, opinions taken, but it was impossible to reach a clear and obviously right decision. The element of luck remained. The fate of Europe was in the balance, and the lives of millions were at stake. Suddenly Eisenhower came forward. ' This is a decision which I must make alone,' he said. ' After all that is what I am here for.' The meeting waited. ' We will sail tomorrow.' Less dramatic in degree, but not less real in quality, is the lonely responsibility in which each of us must make the decisions that matter.

Finally, there is *the loneliness that drives us to Christ.* Was it merely her physical need that drove the woman to this great Physician ? Or was it the realization, fostered by all she had heard of Him, that the issues of the inmost life were too difficult, its burdens too heavy, its decisions too grave for her any longer to handle them alone ? And when at her touch He turned and singled her out the crowd faded from her consciousness, and she was alone again, but this loneliness was different, for she was alone . . . with Him. Loneliness had done its work, and now it had lost its power.

F. S. Smythe, who, in the Everest Expedition of 1933, climbed all alone to the highest point reached, wrote thus of his experience : ' All the

time I was climbing alone I had a strong feeling that I was accompanied by a second person. It even seemed that I was tied to my "companion" by a rope, and that if I slipped "he" would hold me. It seemed to me that this "presence" was a strong, helpful, and friendly one.' The highest discipline of loneliness has been exercised when it has brought a man to Christ, has made him for ever conscious of a Presence that is strong and helpful and friendly, convinced him that if the issues of inward life with their height and depth appal him, if its burdens bid fair to crush him, and he is set to make decisions where a false step is fatal, then, though he should slip, 'He' will hold him up.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Truth.

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE M. DRYBURGH, M.A., GLASGOW.

'Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts.'—Ps 51^6.

It has been well said that the first and greatest casualty of the War is Truth. This is particularly so in the recent War, which was so rooted in propaganda. Yet, now that the War is well over, Truth still limps through the Continent on crutches. There is a widespread suspicion that public utterances and the public Press do not, in any land, tell all the truth. That suspicion is one of the effects of years of propaganda. In countries that were, during the War, occupied by the enemy, great difficulty is found in getting young people to see that lying is morally wrong. During the War they were instructed to tell lies to the Germans in order to mislead them. They were told it was both patriotic and right to do so. And now they are confused when they are told that it is wrong to tell lies. This matter of Truth is part of the whole problem of moral standards—a problem of vital concern both in individual and social life to-day. One of the moral or rather immoral effects of restrictions to-day is the vast amount of untruthfulness that prevails in business transactions. Evasion of some restriction is at bottom a question of being untruthful. How many have refused to sacrifice truth, either in words or in silence, for the sake of getting a little bit extra from 'below the counter'?

It is often very difficult, at times nigh impossible, to disentangle the true from the false. Nothing is so easy as self-deception. We can convince ourselves that our motives in a certain action are pure when in actual fact they may be quite otherwise. How easy it is to see this in other people and to be blind to it in one's self! So Jesus said, 'First cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.' Even when we are very dogmatic that black is black and white is white, there are times when it is, to say the least of it, unwise to rush into our neighbour's field and separate the wheat from the tares. 'Let both grow together until the harvest,' said the Master, who knew what was in man.

These words show how Jesus Himself, with His sane realism, recognized that even the very truth of God gets mixed up with corrupting and false influences in the world. For Him, one of the potent forces among men is the hidden movement of the Father of lies. Plato speaks of 'the lie in the soul' as the secret and powerful enemy of the Good. Yet the recognition of this enemy of God and of man at work in the world called forth from Christ not scepticism but a burning faith in the ultimate victory of what is true. In contrast, consider the attitude of a man like Pilate. At His trial Jesus sought to make clear to Pilate, who had asked Him, 'Art thou the King of the Jews'? that His Kingdom was not like any earthly empire —'My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight.' And then He added, 'To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice' —one of the most searching of all Christ's utterances. Here is an acid test of the moral quality of a man's soul. It is a challenge demanding whether or no a man believes in truth or is a sceptic.

Pilate's answer, 'What is truth?' is the answer of a cynic, 'the expression,' says Godet, 'of a frivolous scepticism such as is frequently met with in the man of the world.' Scepticism is the enemy of truth at all times. There *is* much falsehood in the world mingled with truth; but are we to believe in an everlasting Kingdom of Truth which must in the end prevail or are we to abandon ourselves to a callous and cynical despair about it? In a word, the fundamental choice before us is, whether we stand with Christ or with Pilate.

Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,—
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and, behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own.

Magna est veritas, et prevalet—great is truth and it prevails.

The victory of Truth, judging from that scene in Pilate's judgment hall—a scene symbolic of this perennial conflict—is won only by those who are prepared to walk the way of the Cross. Is it not often the sacrifice that Truth involves that makes men take the false and easy way? The fear of certain or possible suffering, the fear of missing some advantage, the fear of a guilty conscience—such fears lure us from the side of Christ to slink cravenly behind the judgment-seat of Pilate. We praise pioneers in religion, in science, and in social advance who, having caught a vision of some truth, have had to suffer for it. But, while we build the tombs of such prophets and laud their heroism, let us grasp that the same law holds if Truth is to prevail in the ordinary spheres of daily life. There, too, no less than in the high places of science and social reform, inquisitions and

courts of kings, there must be the willingness to make sacrifices that Truth may have its victory. Only so can the social fabric of our life be permeated with the spirit of Truth. Only thus can the evil effects of propaganda be eradicated from the body politic. All moral causes gain their most telling victories from the sacrifices they inspire.

But above all, if Truth is to inspire sacrifice, it must be embodied in personality. It must be not only something we speak or even something we do; it must be something we are. Truth may be told because it is convenient; deeds of Truth may be done because there is no temptation at the time to do otherwise. But the roots of Truth must go deeper than speech and action. 'I *am* the truth,' said Christ; *hence* the words He spake and the deeds He did. With Him there was no 'lie in the soul.' 'The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me.' And, therefore, to Pilate, and to us all, 'every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.' Thus twelve men of Truth started a movement which brought down the Empire of the Cæsars and in its place built the City of God. The prevalence of falsehood in society made them not cynical but valiant for Truth. Indifferentism sinks easily into scepticism and the moral level is lowered till it becomes base. But men who are identified with the Truth, who have made it part of themselves can never yield to that.

'Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour . . .,' they had heard Him say. Only men who are earnest and courageous enough to be the salt of Truth where they live and work, in high places and in low, can arrest the spread of corruption through our social life. It is fatally easy for honest men to turn in disgust from the fœtid atmosphere of falsehood found sometimes in ecclesiastical and political and civic circles, but that reaction is perilously near the sneering cynicism of Pilate. To stand amid those who jeer and mock, and before men of power like Pilate, and in quiet sincerity bear witness to the Truth —that is how Truth fights its battles and wins its victories.

It is by dwelling close to Him who is the Truth, by receiving His spirit of Truth into our hearts, that we shall have 'truth in the inward parts,' which God desires. We shall be 'of the truth' and His inner voice will exorcise the lie in the soul. Standing with Christ to-day, then, let our faith be that 'the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness apprehendeth it not.' 'Ye are the light of the world . . . let your light shine.'

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Work.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, B.D., TH.M., GLASGOW.

'My Father worketh . . . and I work.'—Jn 5^{17}.
'The Spirit also helpeth.'—Ro 8^{26}.

One of the most helpful ways of thinking of the Three Persons in the Unity of the Godhead is to think of their differing functions. God is one God, but He shows Himself to us, at one time, as God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; at another, as God the Son, the Saviour of the world; and at another, as God the Spirit, the Renewer of our souls. Fundamentally a unity, they have different functions. They are at one, however, in this, that they all work. 'My Father worketh . . . and I work.' 'The Spirit also helpeth.'

If it seems to us that there is something improper, or vulgar, in the thought of God working, it shows that we have the wrong ideas, not only of work, but of God Himself. The God of the Christian revelation is no unmoved mover—no impassive spectator of the world He has made, but a working God—living and active. He is active in creation and preservation, active in redemption, and active, if we but allow Him, in our own hearts and lives.

The Old Testament writers had a very clear idea of the wonderful work of the Creator. 'And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.' 'When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,' and rather quaintly, 'It is time for thee, Lord, to work.'

God scamped nothing in His work of creation, and, whether we consider the starry heavens above, the perfection of detail in a flower, the power in a single atom, or how fearfully and wonderfully we ourselves are made, we may say, 'Marvellous are thy works.'

Christ, when He came, was at one with the Father in the perfection of His work. He was a craftsman on whose bench, we may be sure, no shoddy article was ever made, a manual worker who was not afraid or ashamed to work with His hands. When the time came for His ministry to commence He worked just as hard, ceaselessly preaching, travelling, and healing—healing which cost Him effort and strength. A seven-day week was often His—without time even for meals or sleep. Then came the time when He said to the Father, 'I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.' So, He went to fulfil the purpose for which He was born, the cause for which He came into the world. The last work of the Carpenter of Nazareth was to make a bridge from earth to heaven, and He made it in the shape of a Cross. When He knew that all things were now accomplished He said, 'It is finished,' and gave up the ghost. Came the Resurrection Morn with its proof of the all-sufficiency of the work of Christ, and at last His ascension to make intercession for us.

God, the Father, has made the world. God, the Son, has redeemed it. Even yet the work did not finish, and is not and shall not be finished till every ransomed soul is safely gathered in. Christ has paid the price, but the Devil has not handed over the hostages. This is the work of God, the Holy Spirit. The faith that brings us to the Father in penitence, through Christ, is the work of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit teaches us to pray, enables us to cry, 'Abba Father,' and empowers us to grow in holiness and grace. He assists us to begin to give the management of our lives to Christ. 'My

Father worketh . . . and I work.' 'The Spirit also helpeth.'

What is the application of all this, the point of it for our day? First of all, it is clear that the doctrine of a working God has something to say in the field of politics and social economics. A hundred years ago an industrial burgh in Scotland could take as its motto: '*Laborare est orare*,' 'Working is praying.' How different now is the point of view! Weary of a life of unremitting labour, and little leisure, and suspicious of exploitation by Capitalism—a long campaign has been fought for shorter hours and longer holidays. It is not to deny the need or value of those claims to say that they have had the effect of bringing work into disrepute. Work has come to be despised as something to be borne, only for the sake of wages, or, as at best, a necessary evil. No longer is it seen as a means of imitating and of serving God. If compulsory unemployment is a crime against God and man, as it is, so also is voluntary idleness, and half-hearted labour. Too short hours of work are just as scandalous as too long. There is good sense and good theology in Jack London's parody of a famous hymn:

> Now I get up to do my work,
> I pray the Lord I may not shirk,
> If I should die before the night,
> I pray the Lord, my work's all right.

A State which permits or encourages laziness is not only courting disaster but is flouting God, whose will it is that we should serve Him in the service of our fellows, in our daily work. 'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might' is sound and scriptural advice.

Nor should we ever be ashamed of our work whatever it may be. To say 'I'm only a labourer,' or 'I'm only a working man,' is to be falsely modest. To disparage our work is to disparage God who gave it to us, and who is Himself a worker. Our service of our fellows is service to God whether we lay gas mains, drive tramcars, teach, wash dishes, write, sell goods, manage, direct, or even make people laugh and forget their worries. If we do something which is of real use to our fellows, we are of use to God Himself.

If our work is dull or uninteresting, and seems to help people only a little, we may find in the work of the Church a means of filling up the measure of our service to God and man. Even if we are old and helpless we can work hard at prayer, and find some one to whom we can write or speak a word for Christ. One of the most helpful Christian workers in Glasgow is an old lady of ninety-seven years, whose many visitors never leave without hearing some word of testimony to the faith that is in her. Members of the Church are not called to be served by the Church, or ministry, but to be fellow-workers with the minister in the work of Christ. It is part of a Christian's duty to seek to gather into the Church, and into the knowledge of God's redeeming love, all of those about him who meantime walk meanly or sadly, or blunderingly, for lack of Christ. There is a job for the Church in the world just now and there is a job for each and every individual in it. It is our duty to seek and to make, and to take every chance of working for Christ, whose work for us is perfect and complete.

Let us then see to it that God's plan for us that we should work is not baulked by bad economics, or by timid, selfish, or muddled politics. Let us not be ashamed of our daily work, if it be honest and helpful to our fellows. Let us not be slow or reluctant to work for Christ's Church—to be fellow-labourers with God, servants of Christ, workers with the Holy Spirit. So shall we be caught up into the life of God, and when our day of life is ended, we shall be able to say to God, with Christ, 'I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do,' and so hear from His lips—'Well done, thou good and faithful servant . . . enter thou into the joy of thy lord.'

Principal T. M. Lindsay.[1]

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Killermont.

Of the big four of my time, Lindsay, Denney, G. A. Smith, and Orr, the largest and richest personality was that of Principal Lindsay. In the past lay his long and fruitful convenership of the Assembly's Foreign Mission Committee, and his pugnacious and ardent defence of his friend, Robertson Smith, in the famous heresy case. On that issue, as in the hold-up of the Union negotiations in 1872 his Church had rejected his frank and courageous counsel in favour of the more calculating diplomacy of Principal Rainy. His own comment was, 'I never was a success in the Assembly. My nose irritates people.' Yet it may have been a calamity for Free Church policy that Rainy preferred the services of henchmen to co-operation with an independent colleague.

[1] At the Trinity College, Glasgow, Union Meeting on the return to its buildings after the War years the President, the Rev. R. W. Stewart, in the course of an address, gave these reminiscences of one of its former Principals, the famous Church historian, who was the father of the present Master of Balliol.

His devotion to the Foreign Mission enterprise probably accounted for the fact that until his later years his class-work made no extraordinary impression. About 1900, however, after his resignation of that convenership, and after he had learned typewriting, his lectures kindled into brilliance and his spell over his students became as strong as that of his colleagues. Older men listened a little wonderingly to the rising tide of enthusiasm about his teaching until the reason for it was disclosed in the volumes that began to appear on *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, and *The History of the Reformation*, and in his contributions to *The Cambridge Modern History*.

A vast amount of original observation as well as learning had been steadily accumulating during the earlier period. His library, as he boasted, was mostly of books that could not be found anywhere else in this country—odd pamphlets and ancient volumes picked up on his Continental wanderings. His mind was also becoming a library of relevant facts noted in the course of his travels. 'Mothers take up your children,' is an apparently solemn instruction in an ancient rubric; but with what delight Lindsay explained that he had himself seen the situation to which it applied when he had happened to visit a Syrian congregation. The men and women sat apart, the babies crawled about from mother to father during the service until the celebration of the Eucharist was imminent. At that point all stray infants were captured and firmly held. The deification of Roman emperors was illustrated by Lindsay from his Indian experiences where he had found a ritual in honour of a highly esteemed British civil servant which consisted in the religious consumption of brandy and cigars; and where he had seen a letter addressed 'To the Almighty God, c/o the British Raj, c/o X. Y. Esq.' When Lindsay talked or wrote about the German Reformation it was about places he knew, folk whose songs and picture-books he had enjoyed, and, an odd point, people with whose dress he was familiar. For he had become acquainted with a famous fashionable dressmaker in London whose hobby had been the accumulation of an enormous and priceless museum of historical costumes. There with Madame's guidance the historian, on many visits to the Capital, spent hours of careful study. An ideal Church history book, he held, should be 75 per cent. life and 25 per cent. doctrine, and not the reverse proportion usually found. He was gleefully conscious of the distress caused to a High Church friend by a sermon of his on the passage in James about elders praying and anointing the sick. This referred, the sermon explained, to a favourite ancient remedy of rubbing with oil and asking a blessing on the treatment.

It was remarkable how little regard this erstwhile brilliant metaphysician seemed to retain for the philosophical interests of his youth. To a young Oxford don grumbling at having to teach Greek history he replied dryly, 'History will do you good, keep you to facts.' He had an amused recollection of his own first sermon. 'I am that I am' had been the text, and he maintained that while he feared that it had no other merit it had been a remarkably clear and succinct summary of Hegel's main position. He said wistfully of Calvin that he required only four or five hours of sleep, and that his wife allowed no visitors into his study. 'Such conditions would give any one a chance of being a great theologian.'

Lindsay had an enormous range of reminiscence which made his talk of unusual interest. In his probationer days he was one of the two or three who were admitted to the secret of Thomas Carlyle's visits to Professor Blackie, and allowed to call. In a little room, blue with smoke, Carlyle sat puffing his pipe up the chimney, which he seemed to think carried off the reek. 'I always smoke this way,' he said. 'My wife,' and Lindsay said his voice always caught and broke at that word, 'my wife did not like tobacco.' With Parnell, the Irish leader, he had travelled in connexion with the crofter agitation. He recalled the Disruption worthy, the Earl of Kintore, as a fellow-guest in a pious household in Edinburgh. The Earl would vainly try to bring to a conclusion the interminable grace after meals by interjecting after each period a loud and would-be final 'Amen' which the host, however, interpreted as a fervent encouragement to prolong the devotions.

With his students Lindsay was always happy, though, as the curriculum brought him into contact with them only at the third year, he was perhaps less intimately known than other teachers. In any one with any peculiarity, either of stupidity or cleverness, he was specially interested. He gave an impression of entire frankness and independence and genial imperturbability, unpretentious and unreserved, with no scrap of reverence for conventional authorities or distinctions, regarding truth as a common possession to be sought and shared on equal terms.

Almost every memory of him is coloured by the recollection of the merry courage with which he stood at bay against his mortal enemy, asthma. The good point about it, he said, is that it is never fatal. Muffled up at his fireside on a foggy night he confided to some friends at another time with amused and sceptical detachment that a young 'locum' called in in the absence of his physician was proposing to cure him by some horrible diet

that one gathered he was meekly following. If this long struggle with ill-health kept him from continuing to be a well-known figure in public life, the resulting concentration on his writing raised him to the highest position as an authority on his subject. His books are on all our shelves and are still alive. They are of the kind that makes praise at once easy and superfluous.

In Principal Lindsay deep personal piety and warm evangelical faith were combined with broad and tolerant sympathies. Under a gay and humorous and matter-of-fact outlook there could be discerned a cheerfully heroic quality of soul. His death occurred in the confusion of the outbreak of war in 1914, and thus comparatively little notice was given at the time to the passing of a great personality. I use this occasion in his own College to make this late tribute of admiration and affection.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Babylonian and Hebrew Psalms. In modern times many writers have studied the Babylonian and Hebrew Psalms in comparison, and widely differing conclusions have been drawn. In an important essay published in 1926, G. R. Driver [1] emphasized the differences between Hebrew and Babylonian psalmody, while recognizing the many similarities of phrase and idea between them, but this essay necessarily presented his conclusions and not the detailed evidence on which they rested. Hence G. Widengren,[2] of the Swedish school, which tends to overstress the common character of the culture of the ancient Near East, assembled much material to refute Driver's thesis, which he pronounced surprising. Now the Catholic scholar, R. G. Castellino,[3] has published a careful study of certain types of psalms in the two literatures, and has reached conclusions very similar to those of Driver, but fully documented with the actual texts.

Castellino limits himself to psalms of individual lament and hymns of praise in the two literatures, and studies first the various types of Babylonian lamentations (with the exception of public laments) and their Hebrew counterparts, and then offers a comparison between them. Next he does the same, but on a smaller scale, for the hymns, studying each literature separately first, and then comparing them. Throughout he pays careful attention to the literary forms and to questions of language and style, and recognizes all that links the two literatures together, and seeks nowhere either to evade his evidence or to force his conclusions on it. He observes that the Hebrew psalms show much greater flexibility of form than the Babylonian, which are much more stereotyped, and in an appendix he contrasts the loftier idea of God and the monotheism of the Hebrew with the ideas of the Babylonian poems. He denies that there was any direct influence of the Babylonian psalms on the Hebrew, though he allows that there may have been indirect influence through a Canaanite medium. The chief value of the book lies not in any novel conclusions, but in the judicious assembly of the evidence that sustains them.

[1] 'The Psalms in the Light of Babylonian Research,' in *The Psalmists*, ed. by D. C. Simpson.

[2] *The Accadian and Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation as Religious Documents* [1938]. Stockholm: Bokförlags Aktiebolaget Thule.

[3] *Le lamentazioni individuali e gli inni in Babilonia e in Israele* [1939]. Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale.

The Book of Habakkuk. The Swiss Professor, Paul Humbert, has published a very detailed study of the Book of Habakkuk,[4] which has given rise to so many views in modern times. Earlier Humbert had argued that the Book of Nahum was a liturgy composed for the festival of celebration of the fall of Nineveh in 612 B.C.,[5] and here he similarly finds that the Book of Habakkuk is a carefully integrated liturgy. In this he is not a pioneer, for Mowinckel had already suggested that this book was a liturgy composed for a day of public prayer,[6] and this idea has been adopted by Balla [7] and Sellin.[8] Humbert takes this idea, and for the first time defends it by a thorough examination.

He finds the contents of the book to consist of a complaint (1^{2-4}) followed by an oracle (1^{5-10}), a second complaint (1^{11-17}) followed by a second oracle (2^{1-5a}), five imprecations (2^{5b-20}), and a prayer (3), and adduces a number of parallels to the general form from other parts of the prophetic canon and from the Psalter. Next follows a detailed study of the text of the book, and a translation of the reconstructed text Humbert proposes. After this we have a careful study of the entire vocabulary of the book in the order of occurrence in the text, with complete lists of the

[4] *Problèmes du livre d'Habacuc* [1944]. Neuchâtel: University Press.

[5] *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* [1926], 266 ff.; *Archiv für Orientforschung* [1928–9], 14 ff.; *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* [1932], 1 ff.

[6] *Psalmenstudien*, iii; *Kultprophetie und prophetische Psalmen* [1923], 27.

[7] *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2nd ed., ii. 1556 f.

[8] *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 7th ed. [1935], 119.

occurrences of the word or particular usage elsewhere in the Old Testament, leading to the conclusion that there is nothing inconsistent with a seventh-century date for the composition, and much that definitely points to this date throughout the whole book, and that the vocabulary is a mixture of the prophetic vocabulary and that of the Psalter. Humbert then considers the identity of the tyrant in this book and rejects the view of those who identify him with the Assyrians, and still more emphatically the identification with Alexander. Instead he identifies the tyrant throughout with Jehoiakim. This leads to the final study of the work and the man, in which it is held that Habakkuk was a cultic prophet attached to the Jerusalem Temple, who composed this liturgy for a ceremony of intercession in 602–601 B.C. His originality lies in his synthesis of prophetic thought and the official cultus, in the boldness with which he incorporates the prophetic faith in a public cultic act, and in the idea of using a liturgy to attack the syncretism of a monarch who was more Oriental than Israelite.

Of the brilliance of Humbert's work there can be no doubt, and it is a great gain to have an interpretation which sees in the book a unity in which even the psalm of ch. 3 can find a place. Unity of time is also found, as against Cannon's view,[1] which made the first part of the book a prophecy of the coming of the Chaldæans to execute Divine discipline on Israel, and then found a later denunciation of the Chaldæans, after the prophet had had some experience of their cruelty, while leaving ch. 3 wholly unintegrated. Despite the brilliance, however, the reviewer is not convinced of the soundness of the thesis. He thinks it wholly improbable that in the official cultus of the royal shrine a liturgy directed against the king, and especially such a king as Jehoiakim, would have been tolerated, and the attitude of the Temple authorities towards Jeremiah does not suggest that they would have been interested in such a ceremony. He is on general grounds doubtful of the tendency to turn the prophetic books into liturgies. That the prophets, both true and false, both cultic and non-cultic, delivered oracles is the one securely known fact about them, and all that is susceptible of interpretation as oracle is preferably to be so interpreted. Moreover, the reviewer has been persuaded by T. H. Robinson that the prophetic oracles were normally — though not invariably—short, and he finds no necessity to seek to impose unity of time on a whole book. Nevertheless, no reader can fail to learn greatly from this book, and the demonstration of a seventh century background for the whole seems to the reviewer conclusive.

The Baptism of Fire. A Swedish dissertation by C. M. Edsman on 'The Baptism of Fire' was published in 1940.[2] This is a careful and learned piece of work — citing texts in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac — on an out-of-the-way theme. For the author traverses the ideas on this baptism expressed in the eschatology and the cult of Early Christian and Jewish groups, and especially heretical groups, where the subject seems to have attracted more attention than in orthodox circles. He begins with Origen's Homily on Lk 3^{16}, and cites also a passage from his Homily on Ps 36, where the river or lake of fire is likened to the Red Sea, which brought destruction to the Egyptians but deliverance to the Hebrews. Here the double function of fire, purifying and destroying, is brought out, and the same double motif runs through much of the evidence Edsman assembles. Not a little of it runs back to Dn 7^{10}, and the river of fire that flows before the throne of God is held to be the same that flows in Hell. Thus from a Jewish source the author culls the conception of the river of fire in which the angels are bathed and regenerated, and which is then poured on the heads of the wicked in Hell. Alongside Dn 7^{10} other texts figure as the source of speculation, amongst them Gn 3^{24} and Mt 3^{11}.

Edsman believes that the ideas developed in the literature he studies must have been derived from foreign and non-Christian sources, though he does not endeavour to trace their origin. But the fact that they seem to have been found especially in popular writings in Gnostic sects and in Oriental churches, suggests this to him, since these were all circles that might be expected to preserve ancient and local religious ideas. At the same time they are all related to Biblical texts, and are speculations which might have been started from them, though it is probable that Edsman is right in thinking that outside ideas have contributed not a little to their development.

The eschatological texts he studies are associated with Valentinianism, Judaism, the martyrdom of Theodore, the Apocalypses of Peter and Paul, certain other Coptic texts, and Ephraem Syrus. He then turns to study the cult because it constitutes an anticipation and a realization of the life in the Hereafter and of the celestial reality. It is therefore important not alone because of its embodiment in its symbols of the ideas of the faith, but because of its power to propagate those ideas and to make them vital in the life and thought of the adherents of the faith. Here Edsman studies in particular baptismal rites, and treats too of the mystics and ascetics of Egypt and of Syria, who use the terminology of the cult, despite the fact that they isolated themselves more or less from the Church.

Throughout, the author is more concerned to assemble material than to draw large and hazardous conclusions from it, and he is to be commended for his restraint. His study, which is provided with a good Bibliography, will be of great value to all who desire to wander in these bypaths of Christian knowledge.

The Theology of Proto-Luke. From Sweden too comes a substantial work, under the title

[1] *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* [1925], 62 ff.

[2] *Le baptême du feu* (*Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, ed. A. Fridrichsen, ix.). Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln.

The Messiah and the People of God, by Harald Sahlin.[1] The sub-title indicates that it consists of studies in the Proto-Lukan Theology. The reader must beware, however, of thinking of Proto-Luke here in the terms of Streeter's hypothesis, for Sahlin's view of the origin of the Third Gospel differs considerably from Streeter's. Indeed, whereas Streeter's Proto-Luke begins with ch. 3 of the Gospel, most of the present work is devoted to a detailed study of the Proto-Lukan pre-history (*Vorgeschichte*) in the first two chapters of the Gospel. It is curious to observe that Streeter's *The Four Gospels* does not figure in the extensive bibliography given by Sahlin, though it is referred to in a footnote. A brief article by Streeter published in German stands in the bibliography, but neither his major work, nor some other English work referred to in footnotes, appears there. The reason cannot be the author's unfamiliarity with English, however, since English work is often quoted in the text of the book.

Sahlin's Proto-Luke includes material ranging from Lk 1^5 to Ac 15 in the originally combined Luke-Acts. He thinks it stood in Hebrew for the portion Lk 1^5-3^{7a} and in Aramaic from 3^{7b} on, and its author was an unknown Jewish convert to Christianity, possibly from Antioch. It is then believed to have been rendered into Greek and perhaps expanded by the preface and the second half of Acts, and the translator and editor is believed to have been Luke the Physician. Sahlin dates Proto-Luke *c.* A.D. 50, and the preparation of the completed Luke-Acts A.D. 60–65.

[1] *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk : Studien zur protolukanischen Theologie* [1945]. Uppsala : Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri.

Nearly two-thirds of the present book (250 pages) is devoted to a detailed commentary on those parts of Lk 1f. which Sahlin assigns to Proto-Luke. To this much learning is brought, and the reader is frequently presented with a reconstructed Hebrew text. There follows a literary criticism of this pre-history, and a review of its theological interest and ideas. It is held to have a primarily messianic interest, but to rest on an Adoptionist Christology. On this view Proto-Luke knew nothing of the Virgin Birth, but regarded Jesus as Messiah Designate from His birth, but Messiah only when He received the Divine call at His baptism. Some of these ideas are not new with Sahlin, and in particular he is by no means the first to suggest that the words ' seeing I know not a man ' are a gloss in Lk 1^{34}. The parallel with 1^{24} is in favour of their originality, however. Both Zacharias and Mary ask how they can believe the incredible news they receive, and each states why it is incredible, the one on grounds of age and the other on grounds of condition. The historicity of the Virgin Birth cannot be established by the presence of these words in an obviously highly artistic literary narrative ; but neither can it be disproved by removing them. In the assumed Hebrew original the desiderated Perfect לֹא יָדַעְתִּי would stand, which could as easily be rendered by οὐ γινώσκω here as it is in the LXX in Gn 4^2. For the Perfect of this verb corresponds to either the Past or the Present in English, as is well known. And if the translation is not quite the Greek we should expect from a Greek stylist, the same can be said of ἐποίησε κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτῷ in 1^{51}, where Sahlin retains the words.

Entre Nous.

The Expository Times.

The late date of issue of the March Number was most unfortunate but it was unavoidable. One of the measures the Government took in the interest of fuel economy during the crisis was to prohibit publication of periodicals during a certain period.

A new series of articles dealing with the underlying unity of the New Testament will start in the May number. The first article will be contributed by the Bishop of Derby, Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson. The following articles will be by Professor A. M. Hunter, Professor T. W. Manson, and Principal Vincent Taylor.

Recent Poetry.

In the six months since I last commented on some of the recent poetry there has been an extraordinary spate of slim volumes of poetry from the publishing houses. It would be interesting to learn the figures of the sales of those volumes which do not rise above the level of mediocre verse.

In this period there have been certain books which deserve mention here. The first of these is a collected edition, very well presented, of the *Poems of Francis Thompson* (Hollis & Carter, 15s.). Here are all the well-known poems and some which appear for the first time. None of the latter will prevent the discerning reader from turning with deepest appreciation to the well-remembered poems. Thompson has no peer when he sings of man's flight from God, and his half-glimpsed visions of eternal things :

From the hid battlements of Eternity
Those shaken mists a space unsettle, then
Round the half-glimpsed turrets slowly wash again,

A volume that intrigued and tantalized me is called *Poems from New Writing 1936–1946* (John Lehmann ; 8s. 6d.). These poems are called a ' mirror ' of the stormy epoch in which they were written. They are not of course a complete mirror, because they are only a collection of such poems as appeared in the periodical *New Writing*. This is not a selection of war-poetry either. The poets that do refer to the War recognize that the battlefield included the dining-room, the office, and the garden. There is therefore a vast difference between the outlook of these poets and those writing about the time of the first World War. The dominant note is one of despair and disillusionment. In illustration here are a few lines from a poem by Edith Sitwell :

. . . yet sounds no more the beat of the heart
But only the sound of ultimate Darkness falling
And of the blind Samson at the Fair, shaking the
pillars of the world and emptily calling.

Or H. B. Mallalieu :

I have nothing to offer but the images of terror,
The memories of too much suffering clouding the valley

There are occasional flashes of deep insight, as when Alun Lewis says :

And though the state has enemies we know
The greater enemy within ourselves.

In this volume we find very few flights of faith —largely I believe because this is a selection from contributions to one journal alone. In that respect it is disappointing, and is not a true mirror of our time, for there are many poets to-day who are sailing their barques into deep waters. And yet I do sense in some of the poets whose works are included in this volume a longing to ' chase the ultimate Grail of good and ill ' as one of them (Norman Hampson) writes. And Pierre Jean Jouve says that if there be no God

. . . . I will establish still
On Nothing over Nothingness the soul's supremacy.

One thing is very clear after reading this anthology, it is that the better-known poets of to-day—Edith Sitwell, Day Lewis, W. H. Auden, and Stephen Spender still stand out above the rest.

Some proof of the statement made above, that there are poets to-day who are writing out of a genuine religious experience, is found in the remaining volumes upon which I want to comment. *These Things Remain* (Staples Press ; 5s.) by Melfin W. Jones is full of a serene faith. But Miss Jones does not shrink from asking questions :

Whither goest thou, Science ?
Towards the good of man,
Or with the hosts of Lucifer
To work his loveless plan ?

R. Swingler has written an excellent first book of poems, *The Years of Anger* (Meridian Books ; 2s. 6d.). Mr. Swingler sees all things as swept along by a strong tide of divine purpose :

. . . my surveyor, grim and harsh,
In secret now reclaims the marsh
That cultivated acres there
May bear a fruit for all to share.

The last book I wish to mention is by Kathleen Raine, *Living In Time* (Poetry, London ; 6s.). This book is full of a rich Christian faith ; a sense of the bitter tragedy of our time is here, but also the pure note of worship :

I offer now my wounds and sighs,—
To One I worship in my grief,
Who chose love's thorns, renounced its rose.

There is a poem on prayer that is like a vein of rich ore ; here is its ending :

And gathering round me those I know
In the close circle of a prayer,
The sleepers, the forgetful, grow
In love, though not in presence, near.

My distant ones, this heart on fire
Is for a candle in your night,
While you lie safe within that care
Whose dark is sleep, whose waking, light.

Consider the depths in the four-line poem on Samson :

Find the way now, blind Samson, with your
fingers
Feel at the latch. The door will open,
And you will let the sky in, your wide sockets
Open these blind temples to the sun.

The religious passion of the poetry is made the more impressive because of the deep sense of to-day's broken values and profound unrest :

And my unrest fathoms the deep of peace,
And by my depth downcast, Lord, you are risen,
Your love's great realm, my separation measures.

In two pieces, *Four Poems of Mary Magdalene*, and *Ecce Homo*, this poet probes deeply and clothes her thoughts with words of true beauty. These two poems are worthy of the highest praise. Quotations are inadequate, but she says of Mary :

She knew the weak who ask for love—He gave.
The proud who scorn the woman—He received her.
She had endured the lust of men—but He had none.
And yet she knew herself beloved by Him alone
Whom, weeping, she asked only to adore.

My last extract is taken from *Ecce Homo* :

Those eyes that opened on our earth at Bethlehem
Were all the world's young eyes ; the eyes of birds,
Wild creature's eyes that know earth's secret
places,
The bee's hexagonal vision of bright flowers,
And the first delicate flagellate touched by the sun
When hope first kindled sense to live and rise ;
Our childhood's innocent eyes, all human eyes
That weep and wonder, watch, and suffer and
surmise.

RONALD W. THOMSON.
Burton-on-Trent.

Strange Harmony.

One of the best accounts of prison life during the War is *Strange Harmony*, by Professor William G. Sewell of West China Union University (Edinburgh House Press ; 5s. net). The prisoners were interned in Hong Kong and they were there during all the War years under the Japanese. Professor Sewell possesses a vivid pen and under his spell we live out these dreadful years of monotony and hunger and imminent danger of death, and we learn to marvel at the courage and faith of those who kept their integrity in face of the worst. The book is a most moving document, full of mere human interest and of inspiration for higher endeavour. There is something extraordinarily appealing in the simplicity and humility and complete sincerity with which this thrilling story is told.

The Virtues of Common Worship.

'It wasn't that the Christian men and women in the camp were outstanding in their goodness and their personalities, but having worshipped God together in fellowship behind the wires, they knew one another in that which was eternal. They could not feel neutral to each other as they had set their faces together towards God. They received the energy of each other's friendship to help them live their daily lives, to keep before their eyes the eternal values which the camp conditions brought into new relief. There were among us the few, mostly humble folk, who were being constantly drawn upon by others ; yet their spiritual reservoirs were deep, not shallow streams, so that the more they gave the more they seemed to have, for they themselves knew the secret of drawing upon God.' [1]

The Origins of the Sermon.

This is the title of a fascinating article by Mr. W. B. Sedgwick in the current number of *The Hibbert Journal*. He traces it back to the Stoics. They were the first preachers among Greek philosophers. The other schools were academic ; the Stoics felt they had a Message and with what would have seemed to Plato indecent fervour they strove to bring converts into the fold. One of their number received the name of 'door-opener' from his habit of domiciliary visits in search of converts.

They had 'salvation' to offer ; their favourite word for the moral reprobate was, *asotos*, literally 'unsaved.' But this was in an ethical sense. Their difference from Christian preachers was that their gospel was purely ethical, not religious. It may be doubted if in the whole of their remains there is any hint that divine help was necessary, or given, or should be prayed for.

Still they were very much in earnest and adopted any kind of method that suggested itself to get their message over. They dealt largely in anecdote, drew their illustrations from familiar situations, enlivened their discourses with dialogue and altercations, invented journeys to heaven and hell, imaginary auctions, wills, and banquets. Their subjects were such as these—live as if you were before the eyes of all, ill-health no evil, lessons from the wrestling school, content, on facing difficulties, what things do and do not matter.

The sermon does not seem to have occupied so large a place in the later philosophy, in spite of the noble example of the Stoics. The advent of Christianity, however, brought it back. The Christian sermon, like nearly everything in the Early Church services, was based on the practice of the Synagogue. But it was not till Chrysostom that it reached its golden age. In his time the custom of applause in church was prevalent. Augustine declared that he was not averse to it in moderation, and one of Chrysostom's sermons, delivering an eloquent protest against applause, fairly 'brought down the house.' One is reminded of a practice of Dr. Chalmers. His church was so crowded with people who came back to the second service that Chalmers intimated that he would preach the same sermon at night as he had just delivered in the morning, with the result that the evening congregation was as great as ever !

My Faith and My Job.

'The work of helping men to obey God in their secular callings and as citizens is going on in quiet ways in many parishes and congregations where some minister or layman is alive to the problem. . . .

'A Scottish minister in a large rural parish in which nearly every person was at least nominally connected with the Church got together a group of farmers and potato-growers. For a whole winter they studied together Emil Brunner's *The Divine Imperative* (what stronger indication could there be that the Scots have preserved their mental toughness and endurance ?). It was impossible to study this book without calling into review the daily work of these men, and the upshot was that a number of them decided that certain practices in common use in the vicinity would have to be abandoned. One farmer entirely overhauled the wage rates of his employees and discussed with them the vexed question of the tenancy of tied cottages. These decisions were made and adhered to at considerable financial loss.' [2]

[1] W. G. Sewell, *Strange Harmony*.

[2] *The Christian News-Letter*, 22nd January 1947.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.